

Chapter 8

Psychodynamics, Gestalt Psychology, and Personality Theory at Harvard

Harvard likes to be either first or last in everything.

E. G. Boring

For almost half a century, from the day Edwin G. Boring first walked into the halls at Harvard to assume his teaching duties in 1921, to the day that he died in 1967 in Stillman Infirmary, the status and relevance of dynamic theories of personality as a legitimate science played a central role in defining what was even allowed to be called psychology at the University. Boring was against the molar, the psychodynamic, and a science that was person centered because he judged them to be unscientific and he spent his entire career defending that principle. What hung in the balance, insofar as Harvard contributes to the gold standard of what happens in institutions of higher learning in the West, was the more ethereal fate of such theories in the academy and in the wider discipline of psychology at large, both nationally and internationally, influencing their status, then as today.

On the one side, representing psychology as a laboratory science, was E. G. Boring, student of Titchener in the direct lineage of Wundt. Then there was Boring's protégé, Stanley Smith Stevens, experimental psychologist and psychophysicist *par excellence*, and others, such as Edwin Newman, J. G. Beebe-Center, and Karl Lashley, and later B. F. Skinner. Eventually, on the other side stood Gordon Willard Allport, pioneer personality-social psychologist; Henry A. Murray, physician, biochemist, and specialist in abnormal psychology who ran the Harvard Psychological Clinic; and others, such as Clyde Kluckhohn, Robert White, and the aging Morton Prince in psychology; Talcot Parsons and George Homans in sociology; Stanley Cobb in psychiatry, who was Harvard's Bullard Professor of Neuropathology at the Medical School and chief of psychiatry at the Massachusetts General Hospital; and L. J. Henderson, physical chemist and Harvard powerbroker, who paradoxically sponsored both Henry Murray and B. F. Skinner at the same time in psychology. Looming in the background were students such as Saul Rosenzweig, Donald McKinnon, Hadley Cantril, Jerome Bruner, James Grier Miller, and others.

There were also other faculty, such as Pitirim Sorokin, the fiery and rhetorical sociologist into revolutions, and Samuel Stouffer, the statistician. Beyond Harvard, but close in its shadow, was Gardner Murphy, who took an MA in psychology at Harvard and his doctorate at Columbia under William James's old student Robert

Woodworth. Afterward, Murphy returned briefly to teach parapsychology at Harvard in the 1920s; and others, such as Erik Erikson, who first came to Harvard in 1933, and without a college degree of any kind, joined the faculty in both psychology and psychiatry through the influence of Cobb and Murray.

But the man who was probably most influential behind the scenes in shaping the scientific study of personality in the 1930s at Harvard as a Galilean rather than a mere Newtonian science was a German émigré and gestalt psychologist, who only taught from 1938 to 1940 as a visiting professor. That was Kurt Lewin. In the minds of Allport and Murray, Lewin confirmed their emphasis on the possibility of constructing a science of the whole person over against the reductionists who had taken over almost the entire field of psychology. At the same time, their appropriation of Lewin's topological field theory made a place in their definition of scientific psychology for dynamic theories of personality, admittedly more of the gestaltist rather than the Freudian variety alone. Complex as the history of it is, we can only give a bare sketch here.

Edwin G. Boring was a central figure. He was raised in a Quaker-Moravian household in Philadelphia, in a communal arrangement run on strict spiritual values of a fundamentalist sort.¹ The 22 people living communally under two conjoined roofs, which included Boring and his mother and father, were led by two aging spinster sisters, whose purity, as well as absolute authority, were unquestioned. Boring's father, a druggist, appears to have held a relatively minor status in the hierarchy of things, leaving a gap that was soon to be filled by a towering and charismatic figure in the history of psychology, Edward Bradford Titchener. Boring attended Cornell and majored in engineering, but his senior year decided on a course in psychology. Psychology at Cornell was defined by the dictates of E. B. Titchener, originally an Oxford trained Englishman who had taken his PhD under Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig in experimental psychology, and who had then immigrated to the United States. There, he set up an experimental laboratory at Cornell University as a young professor and launched a formidable research enterprise in which he intended to establish German structuralism in the experimental laboratory tradition as the only psychology worthy of the name. His method was the introspective analysis of consciousness, which he trained his students to do in the laboratory, along with the mastery of all the other accoutrements of Teutonic psychology, which included physiological recordings, psychophysical measurements, and reaction time experiments. Aspiring to become the American Wundt, Titchener even rejected as still too eclectic the overly scientific emphasis of the newly established American Psychological Association once he had come to Cornell. In a huff over some issue at some point, Titchener founded his own group, The Society of Experimental Psychologists, which ran as an independent society until 1938.² Within his own domain, he remained in control of how psychology was to be defined, having his own standards. He even lectured in his academic gown, which he later said, allowed him to be dictatorial.

Boring took Titchener's introductory psychology course, which he himself would later adapt to the Harvard curriculum. At the end, as he walked out the door for the last time, he had to pass Titchener, who stood there in his academic robes returning each student's final exam. As he passed across the threshold, Titchener looked

down at him and, handing him his exam, declared in a stentorian voice, “*You* have the psychological attitude,” a compliment that he extended to no other student. It was a prescient moment for Boring, who went off to do engineering for a steel company in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. After a year, Boring decided that engineering was not for him and returned to Cornell to take the PhD under Titchener’s guidance. To underscore the fatherly nature of Titchener’s influence over him, when Boring met his wife-to-be in the laboratory, and then married her, and they went on their honeymoon, after a certain number of days had passed, Titchener sent a telegram that the honeymoon was over; it was time to return to the laboratory as there was work to be done. They, of course, complied.

Titchener’s fortunes appeared to be changing as well. Upon Hugo Münsterberg’s death at the podium while lecturing to students at Radcliffe, Harvard made an offer to Titchener to replace Münsterberg as the senior professor in experimental psychology. Titchener played President Lowell to the maximum with one demand after another, to the point where the offer was withdrawn. So Titchener was out, but Boring was soon in.³ Boring arrived in 1921, with the intent of living out Titchener’s will at Harvard. This meant that he intended to establish experimental psychology in the Wundtian tradition, at Harvard and elsewhere from that vantage point if he could.⁴ The project was temporarily put on hold when he became involved in a serious auto accident and completely lost his memory for a time. His was but a trial run teaching at Harvard as an instructor for a semester. He went to Clark University, after G. Stanley Hall offered him a professorship in experimental psychology. There he taught briefly until he was summarily dismissed related to a misunderstanding over which he had no control. He was able to return to Harvard, where he remained until his death almost 50 years later. Upon his return, however, through a series of political intricacies, while Boring was able to come, Floyd Allport, who was Gordon Allport’s older brother, and Herbert Sydney Langfeld, Gordon Allport’s dissertation chair, were forced to leave.

Floyd Allport and his younger brother Gordon had come from a conservative Midwestern background of four children. They were born in Indiana and grew up in Ohio. Their father was a naturopathic physician, while their mother was a school teacher. She had come from a line of Free Methodists, who practiced stricter prohibitions than even the mainstream Methodist Church. She had rebelled against Free Methodism as an adult, converting first to New Thought and then Christian Science. Gordon Allport himself later returned to mainstream Christianity to become a high Episcopalian.

Gordon matriculated at Harvard in 1915, because his brother Floyd was already there, teaching as Münsterberg’s assistant. As an undergraduate, he majored in psychology and did volunteer work through the Phillips Brooks House, the social service organization for undergraduates at Harvard. Also a member at Phillips Brooks House was Richard Clarke Cabot, ethicist, cardiologist, former student of William James, member with others such as L. J. Henderson and Walter Cannon in the so-called Royce circle, and founder of the Department of Social Services and later chief of the West medical service at the Massachusetts General Hospital. But Allport said in his own autobiography that he did not really get to know Cabot until he began

teaching in the Department of Social Ethics in 1924.⁵ Cabot had been instrumental in developing The Boston School of Social Work at Simmons College in 1904, the first professional school of social work in the United States, and involved with founding the Department of Social Ethics at Harvard under Rev. Francis Greenwood Peabody in 1905. Cabot's emphasis was on development of the spiritual dimension of personality in a secular age, and his connections to religion, philosophy, and psychology at Harvard satisfied Allport's alternate urge to lean toward the ministry. As a beginning student, Allport did volunteer social work through The Phillips Brooks House. In this regard, Cabot, among others, was also Allport's link to the Jamesian ethos at Harvard.

Allport graduated in 1919. During W.W.I, he had been an inductee in the Student's Army Training Corps, where social service continued to play a most important role in his life. After graduation, he then spent a year teaching at Robert College in Turkey, and afterward returned to Harvard, where he received his PhD in psychology in 1922 under Herbert S. Langfeld, James Ford, and William McDougall with a dissertation on trait theory.

Allport retold an amusing story in his autobiography while he was preparing his dissertation that serves as a clue to his mettle. Titchener was visiting Clark University with some of his graduate students as Boring's guest and they invited Langfeld and Allport from Harvard to join their seminar. When they got there, Titchener dominated the conversation for most of the time, and then at the very end permitted each graduate student to state the topic of his research project, which he had assigned them. When they got around to Allport, Allport announced he was studying the traits of personality, and got a reception of glowering silence. Afterward, Titchener pulled Langfeld aside and demanded to know why he had permitted Allport to choose that topic. On the return trip to Cambridge, Allport was devastated that he had been rebuked by the great Titchener and he was tremendously embarrassed. He confessed to Langfeld that he was really unprepared in biology, mathematics, and the more experimental laboratory aspects of science, until Langfeld interrupted him and said, "Don't worry, there are many humanistic pastures in psychology." And besides, he declared, "you don't really care what Titchener thinks." Suddenly, it was a revelation for Allport to be able to admit that actually he really didn't care what Titchener thought. He could be committed to psychology, but still go his own way.

The dissertation was entitled "An Experimental Study of the Traits of Personality, with Application to the Problem of Social Diagnosis" (1922).⁶ It had absolutely nothing to do with dynamic theories of personality except that Allport reviewed briefly the work of Janet, Freud, and Prince but in a historical section that showed he was no historian. He also adapted Jung's traits of introversion and extraversion to an elaborate statistical study, but he misspelled the word as "extroversion" and admitted that he had significantly modified what Jung had originally been getting at. It was mostly a classic experimentally oriented document in the lineage of Floyd Allport, J. B. Watson, and Walter Dearsborn that attempted to establish not only trait theory, but psychology and its methods as an experimental laboratory science. The applied part went one step farther in its advance of social psychology as the experimental analysis of behavior.

After completing his dissertation, Allport then spent 2 years studying abroad in Germany and England, where he was influenced by German holism, the study of character and temperament, graphology, the theories of Eduard Spranger, the personalism of William Stern, and gestalt psychology.⁷

There is also the matter of Sigmund Freud, whom Allport met on his trip. Traveling through Vienna with some extra time on his hands, the young and self-assured Allport, the recent Harvard graduate, decided that while he was in Vienna he might drop by and meet Freud to see what he was like. Quite otherwise unannounced, he called to say he was coming and Freud acquiesced. On the way over in a tram, he observed a prim and fussy hausfrau reprimanding a little boy in her charge. The seat was apparently dirty and the boy did not want to sit down and there was some unpleasant exchange between them. When Allport arrived at Bergasse 19, he was ushered in and sat down. There was then a moment of awkward silence, as Freud sat expectantly waiting to hear why Allport had wanted to see him. Allport, for his part, became extremely uncomfortable and thought to himself that he would just describe what happened on the tram, so he blurted out the story. Freud leaned forward and asked simply, "And was that little boy you?" Allport was then tremendously annoyed. Of course the little boy wasn't him. Why was Freud reading something into Allport's account? This he thought quite presumptuous, and left immediately. He remained indignant about Freud for the rest of his life, which, at the moment further confirmed his original behavioristic leanings. As it turned out, he may have held a grudge personally against Freud for what Allport perceived was a misplaced embarrassment, but he would later turn approvingly to psychoanalysis and incorporate an Americanized version of the unconscious into his own model of personality.

One of the influences that worked to liberalize Allport's thinking about a dynamic theory of personality was gestalt psychology, a psychology which, paradoxically, had no theory about the unconscious, but rather was derived from the German experimental laboratory tradition, but not the Wundtian.

German psychology had become somewhat transformed during the Weimar Republic. Wundt had died in 1920 and the influence of his school was waning, but by no means dead. The effect of World War I on Germany was to stimulate an era of holism in German science unprecedented in its previous history. Gestalt psychology, which had developed around Wertheimer, Koffka, and Köhler in Stumpf's laboratory after 1905, also came to include Kurt Lewin who would have a central influence on Allport's theories.

Allport was also significantly influenced by Edward Spranger. Spranger was a philosopher of education and follower of Wilhelm Dilthey who radically opposed the methods of natural science and preferred those of a more humanistically oriented psychology, which he called *Geisteswissenschaften*. Spranger even demanded a return of the word psychology from the experimentalists so it could be more properly employed for the science of a meaningful and fulfilled life. He developed a typological theory of personality based on six ideal categories, although individuals could be characterized as mixtures of each one. They were the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, religious, and a power type, with one type predominating over the others.⁸ He believed sufficiently in the principle of individuality

that he openly stood against the mass testing of students in the gymnasium in the early 1920s.

Allport was also attracted to the Graphology movement in Germany of Ludwig Klages. This was a popular movement that believed handwriting analysis was a key to understanding an individual's soul, and was a more accurate predictor of job performance than standardized tests.⁹ Mitchell Ash reports that Klages's work was based on the ideas of the Romantic philosopher Carl Gustav Carus, who believed that expressive movements of a person's body were the key to understanding their character. Allport would exploit this idea later in his own theories to counter the influence of the nomothetic reductionists who wanted American psychology to focus only on mass statistics.

The psychologist who seemed to have the biggest looming influence on Gordon Allport's theorizing was William Stern, the man in the Clark University photo of 1909 standing next to William James. It was he who advocated a personalistic psychology, meaning a science that was centered on the person. Stern had studied at Berlin with Ebbinghaus and Stumpf, and was noted for his differential psychology and contributions to education, and remembered for his psychophysical work and the invention of the tone variator.¹⁰ His great criticism of the gestaltists was "No Gestalt without a Gestalter," in that he sought to shift the focus of psychology from the interaction of the organism and the environment to personality as the central motif of perception.

Stern, known as a pioneer in differential psychology, was born and raised in Berlin in 1871 and was weaned away from Ebbinghaus by the works of Lazarus and of Paulsen, leading him to the synthesis of cultural and experimental science in 1893 in his doctoral dissertation.¹¹ He went to Breslau thereafter and developed the tone variator for which he is remembered by the experimentalists,¹² but he also discussed the conscious present, presaging the phenomenology of gestalt psychology. His works on differential psychology followed in which he declared that individuality would be the psychological problem of the 20th century. He also founded a journal and an Institute. His philosophy he called critical personalism, which he characterized in the context of the second law of thermodynamics and its relevance for mental science. He also formulated the intelligence quotient, or IQ, in 1912, and pioneered in the use of the diary to chronicle adolescent development. He fled Hitler in 1933, first through Holland, and went on to the United States, where he later became a professor at Duke from 1934 to 1938, teaching at Harvard summer school in 1936. In 1938 the English translation of his pioneering text *General Psychology from the Personalistic Standpoint*¹³ appeared, but he suddenly died that year.¹⁴ For Stern, all difficulties were resolved in the person. "This concept and this concept alone. . . could provide the substantiality, the causality, and the individuality required in every mature psychological analysis."¹⁵

The other figure who came to profoundly influence Allport was Kurt Lewin. Lewin began publishing during the World War I. One of his important papers was on camouflage and the war landscape. The other was a critique of G. E. Müller and Herman Ebbinghaus. He gained an international reputation, however, through a series of papers published between 1926 and 1930 in the *Psychologische Forschung*, the

gestaltist's journal, entitled *Untersuchungen zur Handlungs-und Affekt-Psychologie*. He electrified psychologists at the 1929 International Congress of Psychology in New Haven with a film about an 18-month-old child learning to sit down on a stone, upsetting a number of prevailing behavioristic notions about intelligent learning in children at a young age. Allport was exposed to Wertheimer, Koffka, and Kohler's work on his first trip to Germany, but he said in his autobiography that he only came to know about Lewin at that period second hand.

Lewin had originally been a student of Carl Stumpf, like Koffka and Köhler, and he employed gestalt concepts in his experimental research. He also worked closely with Köhler and Wertheimer in the 1920s, but Mitchell Ash presents him as something of an outsider. He was more interested in practical application than pure laboratory work, and he also had a radically different idea about how science should be conducted, and his political and philosophical opinions were well formed before he appropriated from the gestaltists.

Lewin was born in Prussia in 1890 into a Jewish family that celebrated the Protestant religious calendar. His bent was to combine philosophy with natural science, while politically he considered himself a socialist. Like James, he considered science to be pluralistic, developing a comparative theory in which science was empirical, practical, and pluralistic. It was not possible, in other words, to reduce the concepts of biology to physics. Nor was it possible to unify science under just one banner.

Instead, Lewin proposed to marry theory with action. He developed a topological psychology that employed the concept of field forces to understand the total situation. Behavior was always a function of the totality of the organism and the environment. His *métier* was always constructing a geometrical life space in his mind with which he could conceptualize a problem, and the product of his thinking was always a concrete experiment to test the question at hand. Later, this penchant for deriving the solution out of the problem itself instead of superimposing preconceived categories onto it became formalized into a method called action research. For Lewin, research was social practice, even to the point of recreating real life situations in the laboratory.

In the years he taught at the Psychological Institute at the University of Berlin, Lewin attracted a devoted following of students. He was always available, affable, and outgoing and a keen listener of what others had to say. But he was deep and inward in his contemplation of the problems he was working on, which he always tended to fit into his own scheme of things. He sought a geometry for psychology that would define space-time relations in terms of psychological fields of force that more accurately represented organism-environment interactions than performance oriented concepts of measurement. This idea in particular appealed to Allport, as he, too, sought to integrate the principles of gestalt psychology into his evolving conception of the person.

In 1924 Allport returned to Harvard as an instructor in the Department of Social Ethics, where he taught the first course in the United States on the psychology of personality entitled "Personality and its Social Amelioration" that year.¹⁶ In 1926 he became an assistant professor at Dartmouth College, returning to Harvard in 1930,

the same year that Henry A. Murray's apprenticeship ended as Morton Prince's assistant at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, and Murray ascended to the directorship of the clinic, intent on establishing psychoanalysis at Harvard with the help of his compatriot at the Medical School, Stanley Cobb.

Henry A. Murray

Henry Alexander Murray, MD, PhD, clinical psychologist, personality theorist, and ardent Melvillian, was born in 1893 into privileged circumstances. His father's relatives are listed in *Burke's Peerage* and his mother's father was a wealthy New York financier. He saw his first person hypnotized when he was age 9, on a luxury liner returning from England with his parents. An animated conversation was going on at the table next to them which involved some guests and a distinguished looking educated gentleman who held himself with some force of character. The discussion was about hypnosis, and to prove a point, the gentleman interrupted the waiter who was in the middle of clearing the table before them. In front of everyone in the room, he asked the waiter to participate in a brief experiment, placed him into a hypnotic trance, and demonstrated some of the standard effects.¹⁷

Murray prepared at Groton Academy and entered Harvard University in 1911, four years ahead of Gordon Allport, to major in the three Rs, as he told it,—“rowing, rum, and romanticism.” He lived in palatial surroundings in an apartment on Harvard's “Gold Coast” along Mount Auburn Street and soon married Josephine Rantoul, sister of his class treasurer (Class of 1915). Thereafter, he earned the MA in Biology and MD from Columbia College of Physician and Surgeons in 1921 before returning to Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he worked for the physical chemist, L. J. Henderson, empirically verifying the Henderson–Hasselbach equation.¹⁸ This equation attempted to measure simultaneously 17 different variables in a sample of blood, which, according to Murray, later led to the development of blood plasma. The work by Murray and his co-worker Franklin Chambers McLean was to become the model that Murray would later use to develop an entirely new and original theory of personality, called personology—the multivariate study of the individual at many different levels of complexity by a team of trained investigators.¹⁹ Once the empirical work verifying the theory behind Henderson's equation had been completed from the laboratory of physical chemistry in Boylston Hall, Murray went on to study aging in chick embryos at the Rockefeller University.

While he was gone, the aging Morton Prince, neurologist of William James's era and specialist in dissociation theory and multiple personality, approached the Harvard Corporation with an unusual offer. He wished to endow what would be called The Harvard Psychological Clinic, which would be devoted to the scientific study of personality. Seeing the new trends in experimental behaviorism and psychoanalysis, he hoped to preserve the tradition in experimental psychopathology that, with William James and James Jackson Putnam, he had helped launch so long ago. The only clause was that the clinic had to be situated in the psychology department in the School of Arts and Sciences as a research enterprise, not in the medical school

as a therapeutic clinic. In this way, Prince believed that he was striking a blow for the larger view of the person by going right into the Lions' Den of the reductionists.

Harvard accepted the terms and gave Prince a courtesy appointment as Assistant Professor of Abnormal Psychology. But, due to the machinations of L. J. Henderson, Prince was not permitted to appoint his own assistant. In 1926, the same year that Gordon Allport left Harvard for Dartmouth, Henderson offered the position to Henry A. Murray, who accepted, despite having no formal background in psychology but with plenty of experimental laboratory training in science as a physician and biochemist. The first thing Murray did was to take a sabbatical and return to England to finish up a PhD in biochemistry in Haldane's laboratory at the University of Cambridge, awarded 1927.

It was a strange and wonderful year. Murray and Christiana Morgan, a young married socialite who had been having an affair with Murray's older brother, became enamored of each other and began a relationship of their own. Murray was conflicted as to what to do about this situation, since he himself was married, until he decided while he was in England to visit Carl Jung in Zurich and talk over the matter. The details of how he knew to call on Jung are sketchy, but he knew all about Jung through Louis Untermeyer.²⁰ Also, Murray had been able to rent F. W. H. Myers's old house while in Cambridge, William James's close compatriot in the field of psychical research, and James had been one of Jung's early heroes.²¹ At any rate, Murray did meet Jung that year, they sailed up and down Lake Zurich discussing many issues, among them Murray's plight, and launched a lifetime friendship that they had a chance to rekindle on several occasions that lasted up to the time of Jung's death in 1961. Not the least of these connections, Murray introduced Jung to Christiana Morgan. Both she and her husband went into analysis with Jung. In therapy, her paintings using the technique of active imagination depicted her inward struggle toward individuation. Afterward, Jung used them as the basis for his Visions Seminar in Zurich from 1930 to 1934.²²

The other important event to note about Murray's crossing the Atlantic in 1926 was his introduction to the works of Herman Melville. On announcing his intention to go abroad, one of Murray's Harvard school mates had given him a copy of *Moby Dick*²³ to tuck into his jacket pocket for the long hours on deck when there was nothing to do. Murray accepted it without much thought and proceeded to embark on his trip.

Halfway across the ocean, he received an urgent call to rush to the Captain's Cabin, where he found the famous surgeon Sir John Bland Sutton, of the Royal Academy, standing over the prostrate captain. The captain was an extremely large, fat man who was desperately in need of an emergency appendectomy. Sir John would perform the surgery, would Murray care to assist him by administering the anesthetic, since he was the only other physician on board? During the operation, which Murray afterward reported was a success, but extremely bloody due to the Captain's obesity, Sutton went on and on about Herman Melville and why he, Sir John, happened to be on board just this ship at that time. It seems he had been involved with the Royal Society in giving a giant whale skeleton as a gift to a museum and as an enthusiast of Melville he had vowed afterward to visit the little

church in New Bedford, Massachusetts that for its minister's pulpit had a whaling ship's fo'c'sle where the captain usually stands on board his ship. It was the last place where Melville stood on dry land before setting sail at age 25 in 1838, not to return again for 2 years. Glad the captain lived, Murray was even more agog with the Melville story, since he still had the copy of *Moby Dick* in his jacket pocket, which immediately afterward, he read from cover to cover.

On his return to the United States in 1927, Murray immediately went to see Raymond Weaver, a professor of English at New York University who had been the first to write a biography of Melville, just then recently published more than 30 years after the mariner had died in obscurity in 1891. Murray wanted to know if Weaver would mind if an upstart from the domain of the sciences who was interested psychology tried to write a study of Melville. Weaver was not only enthusiastic, but also introduced him to Melville's heirs in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. The sisters were deathly afraid of outsiders, and especially those wanting to write about their relation to Herman Melville. They thought the death of Allan Melville, Herman's father, from maniacal insanity had put a hereditary taint on the family and that succeeding generations would be judged in that light once Melville's own life became unearthed.

But they readily accepted Murray for several reasons. First, he bore a striking resemblance to their absent younger brother. Second, because Allan Melville, Herman's father, had died of lobar pneumonia. Murray had treated such patients as a young medical resident and was able to assure them that lobar pneumonia had a maniacal phase at the end, just before death. They embraced him, invited him to stay as their guest, and allowed him to sleep in Melville's bed, which was still intact. Murray later reported that the experience gave him fantastic dreams, which afterward he could not remember. Before he left, they loaded him up with original manuscripts they still had of some of Melville's most important works, which he subsequently returned. Murray later reported that he worked for several years collecting more documentation before writing up a draft of a biography he called "Young Melville." It was the story based on Melville's own quote, "From my 25th year, I date my life," referring to the day he had left dry land for the sea.²⁴

By then, Murray was well into his new position as director of the Harvard Psychological Clinic, which had developed a reputation as a haven for Freudian and Jungian analysis in Boston. The unpublished draft of the Melville biography was written from a psychodynamic perspective, which everyone who read it presumed was Freudian. It was psychological, in that Murray tried to fathom Melville's state of mind; it was interpersonal, since he examined in detail the relation of the boy to his parents and grandparents, and siblings; and it was developmental, since he was trying to understand the evolution of Melville's personality from birth to age 25.

The central psychodynamic issue that Murray believed was his most original contribution to Melville scholarship was the *amfortas* wound, the blow that struck Melville so deep that he never recovered, a blow that sent him to sea in the first place, and though a profoundly spiritual man, made him an atheist and turned him forever from the Christian scheme of salvation. This wound was sustained by Melville, Murray inferred, from knowledge communicated to him from his uncle, that Allan

Melville, devout father, primary font of his son's early religious and moral upbringing, God-fearing man and pious Calvinist in the Dutch Reformed Church, had sired an illegitimate daughter. Herman Melville went to great lengths to discover who she was, and to locate her whereabouts, according to Murray. But then Melville argued with his mother over revealing the great secret, so his half-sister could be brought into the family. But the rift between mother and son was not mendable and he stormed out, leaving that day for the sea, the day he first dated as the beginning of his life of true spiritual seeing, which before had all been but an illusion.

Distraught that his best friend, Lewis Mumford, had deadpanned the draft as too psychoanalytic, and frustrated because he kept writing and re-writing every sentence because he wanted to write like Melville, Murray tore the draft apart and started again. He would try to revise it twice more over the next 30 years, but to no avail. And for the rest of his life there was a whale on everything Murray owned, as if he, too, was searching for the great white beast. Meanwhile, Mumford went out and quickly published his own biography of Melville. Murray appeared nonplussed because he actually had another agenda than being the second person to publish a biography of Herman Melville. Melville, in fact, in the tradition of James's Leonora Piper and Theodore Flournoy's Helene Smith, was Murray's paradigm case—the single case study for the recapitulation of his budding personological system.²⁵

At the same time, however, though it remained unpublished, the work had a tremendous impact on stimulating Melville scholarship in the field of comparative literature. This was partly due to Ray Weaver, partly to Murray's upper-class stature in the intellectual world at Harvard, and elsewhere, which was fast becoming international, and partly due to a number of long papers and book introductions to Melville's collected works, where Murray's ideas found wide circulation. A younger generation of scholars working on Melville soon found their way to Murray's door at Harvard to fathom what he had been getting at and to see or hear about the phantom document. In this way, Murray also participated in the dissemination of psychoanalytic ideas in their application to literary criticism in the 1930s.

In any event, Christiana Morgan, Carl Jung, and Herman Melville all happened at once to Murray in 1926, and they would form a trinity of affinity, as Robert Rieber calls such concatenations, influencing the course of Murray's development of a dynamic theory of personality to come.

Murray returned in 1927 to teach classes and assist Prince in running the clinic. Prince would lecture to large audiences of undergraduates, but at his advanced age, his energy was spent and the classes were considered dull and boring by most students, except by a few, such as David Shakow and Saul Rosenzweig, who, as acquaintances with the James family heirs and in with Murray, understood the history of what was going on in front of them. At the same time, Murray began to broadcast widely his new interest in Melville and word was out that he was working on a biography.

The young B. F. Skinner turned up in one of his classes, the first course in psychology Skinner had ever taken, as he had been an English major at Scranton College, but he had already determined that behavioristic learning theory was to be his chosen epistemology by the time he had come to Harvard. In his three-volume

autobiography, Skinner recounts that after the very first class he went up to Murray and somewhat smugly said, “Why Professor Murray, I see that you are a *literary* psychologist,” but we have no record of Murray’s immediate response, only the record of their almost-never-on and nearly-always-off-again relationship over the next 60 years.

Prince died suddenly in 1930 and overnight Murray became the director of the clinic, which allowed him to set the course of his own agenda. Prince had wanted the legacy of hypnosis and dissociation to be continued at the clinic, but only the young graduate student Robert White was pursuing those topics. White would go on to pioneer in the single case study in the investigation of whole lives, following Murray’s lead, but at the beginning, he was the one Murray could point to who was reviving Prince’s tradition. Murray, meanwhile, in 1930 was more interested in psychodynamic psychology and the theories of Freud and Jung.

Stanley Cobb

Stanley Cobb was born in 1887, in Brookline, Massachusetts, into the Victorian era, just 22 years after the cessation of the American Civil War.²⁶ His father, also born in Brookline, was a business man who made his money filling in the South Bay of Boston after the Back Bay had already been over colonized by other investors; meanwhile, Cobb’s mother was a native New Yorker. The family lived in Milton, just south of the city, and Cobb attended Milton Academy, once his mother finally decided to let him go to school at all. By then he was 8, having spent the early period being home schooled and set loose in nature to investigate for himself. Cobb became an avid birder, keen naturalist, and a fine artist of wildlife and landscapes. He later said he came to medicine through biology, referring to this early period when he spent most of his time in the woods. He did better in the sciences than the humanities, roomed with Emerson’s grandson, was a member of all the most coveted clubs, and so had an active social life associated with the Boston and Concord scene. He graduated from Harvard College in 1911.

Cobb had petitioned Hugo Münsterberg to undergo hypnosis, as Cobb suffered from congenital stuttering. Münsterberg referred him elsewhere, but it was only a temporary success. In the beginning of his training for the MD, Cobb was still able to ride a horse everyday to get to the Medical School. He also was enlisted in the Massachusetts National Guard. The only point to note here is that his very bad stutter always disappeared when he sang bawdy songs with his Army reserve classmates.

At Harvard Medical School Cobb came under the influence of David Cheever, Walter Cannon, Otto Folin, and L. J. Henderson, among others. His advisor was William T. Councilman, professor of neuropathology, who was father to Christiana Councilman Morgan, who would later become involved with Henry A. Murray. His cadaver mate was Carl Binger, who would be analyzed by Jung in 1929, and go on to become a leading figure in psychoanalysis. Cobb also interned under Harvey Cushing at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital. He missed Freud, Jung, and Ferenczi at the Putnam Camp when they came in 1909, but he was an attendee there socially

in 1913, where he met his future wife, Elizabeth Mason Almy. His stuttering seemed to improve after he got married.

After their honeymoon the couple moved to Baltimore, where Cobb did a post-doctoral fellowship in neurophysiology and psychiatry, under Adolf Meyer. For 3 years, Cobb worked in the new area called psychobiology, an integrative approach to psychiatry that was at once psychological, biological, and social. One of his innovations in teaching medical students was that Meyer had them write out their psychiatric life histories. Meyer later developed this into the Life Chart method, which Cobb also later employed in patient care and student teaching at Harvard. Meyer remained a significant and immediate influence in Cobb's career for over 15 years.

Cobb entered military service in 1918, but was released early in May, 1919, due to the Armistice. David Lynn Edsall summoned him at one point and made him an offer to return to Harvard, which Cobb subsequently accepted. His base of operations in neurology and psychiatry was to be the Massachusetts General Hospital and he worked with Walter Cannon at the Medical School, while he also opened a private practice. His first teaching duties were with Richard Cabot, professor of clinical medicine, and Allport's old mentor, who was also Cobb's wife's second cousin. The most influential person on Cobb's career at that time became William Herman, a young medical intern. Cobb's biographers describe Herman as a junior Moses. He went from the MGH to work with Meyer at Hopkins and afterward underwent a Freudian and Jungian analysis. On his return, Herman led Cobb through the maze of analytic psychiatry in detail, and then married Cobb's secretary.

Meanwhile, Cobb's old cadaver mate, Carl Binger, had introduced Cobb to his then current roommate in New York, Alan Gregg. As an undergraduate, Gregg had accompanied the group that escorted Freud, Jung, and Ferenczi to the Putnam Camp after the 1909 Clark Conference. After attending Harvard Medical School, Gregg began work for the Rockefeller Foundation. The Flexner Report of 1910, sponsored by the Foundation, had been a major call to arms for Western medicine to upgrade its scientific and medical research and to require the MD of all licensed physicians. Gregg soon became involved in distributing large sums of money and traveling around the world founding medical schools. At one point he was responsible for eradicating certain kinds of diseases from microorganisms in countries that benefited from advanced scientific medical education he had funded.

Through Gregg, Cobb met the senior members of the Rockefeller Foundation and they agreed to fund the development of a new center for neurology at Harvard. Neurology had been centered at the Massachusetts General Hospital under James Jackson Putnam since the 1870s, but Putnam had retired in 1912, after converting from neurology to psychoanalysis, and then he died in 1917. The new center would be based at the Boston City Hospital. The result was the Channing and Thorndike research laboratories, which attracted such greats as Derrick Denny-Brown, the neurosurgeon, and later Houston Merritt, discoverer of the anti-epileptic drug Dilantin. The Rockefeller Foundation earnestly desired Cobb to lead the new enterprise, and proposed sending him to Europe for 2 years, with his wife, two children, and their nanny, to investigate neuropsychiatry there and recommend what would make Harvard the premier research facility in that subject in the world.

Meanwhile, Alan Gregg and David Lynn Edsall, Dean of Harvard Medical School, who was also on the Rockefeller Board, wrote up a position paper and presented to the Foundation a proposal to fund the scientific study of personality. The Foundation agreed and this money eventually went to founding liaison psychiatry in a general hospital setting when Cobb opened the Department of Psychiatry at the MGH in 1934. The department at the MGH soon became the centerpiece of the Rockefeller's program to train psychiatrists who passed through there and then went on to found similar departments in other teaching hospitals throughout the United States. The money also went to the Yale Institute of Human Relations, the scientific study of psychoanalytic concepts at the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute under Franz Alexander, and it went to support Henry Murray's endeavors at the Harvard Psychological Clinic.

Cobb returned from Europe and took over neurological research at the Boston City Hospital and also became involved in planning the founding of the Department of Psychiatry at the MGH, which did not actually open for several more years. When it did happen, they just switched staff. Major figures in neurology at the MGH went to the City Hospital and Cobb and his staff moved into the MGH.

Cobb's service was staffed mainly by psychiatrists and social workers trained under Adolf Meyer. Their focus was mainly adult psychiatry, but Cobb also quickly established a children's unit, although it was housed over next to pediatrics. At that point, a major transition began to occur with the coming of Erik Erikson, Erich Lindemann, Gibby Dawes, and Felix and Helena Deutsch, who were all psychoanalysts with direct connections to Freud in Vienna. Suddenly, all the Myerians on the staff were in analysis, desiring to become Freudians. The Rockefeller grant that founded the Department was pioneering, in that it was the first time that Rockefeller had agreed to subsidize not only patient care as part of the package, but it also subsidized a select group of Harvard medical students to undergo Freudian analysis.

Meanwhile, still back in the early 1930s, activities were afoot to found an Institute devoted to psychoanalysis in Boston. Franz Alexander arrived as the senior training analyst and Murray allowed him to meet on Fridays at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, which made the place a hot bed of mainly Freudian but also Jungian activity. The reputation of the clinic could hardly have been further sullied in the eyes of the experimentalists in the Department of Psychology, then still in Emerson Hall. Meanwhile, the clinic was located separately over on Plympton Street in an elegant wooden house. The joke was, "Wysteria on the outside; hysteria on the inside."

Indeed, animosity had developed between Boring and Murray over many issues. Murray believed that Boring was particularly piqued because everywhere he turned he was being trumped by Murray. Murray himself later said that he believed Boring thought Murray himself was the source of Boring's ulcer. More to the point, Boring was no doubt galled that while he invited everyone to bring their lunch to the laboratory on Fridays and he provided the burnt coffee, Murray was over at the Harvard Psychological Clinic entertaining visiting dignitaries with catered meals in elegant surroundings.

This later developed into a significant issue, as Boring launched a program to test psychoanalytic concepts by calling on a number of experimental psychologists who had undertaken therapy to submit evaluations of their treatment. These were subsequently published in one of the APA's psychological journals. Boring himself did not fare well, as his analyst suddenly left town and Boring had a panic attack. His only recourse was to call on Murray for assistance, which assuredly heightened the approach-avoidance conflict that had developed between them.

At any rate, after a year Alexander was called to the Chicago Psychoanalytic Institute, and Hans Sachs, one of Freud's original circle, arrived in Boston as the designated training analyst. Sachs was a lawyer, but, because of his advanced status in the newly forming psychoanalytic community, was permitted to attend grand rounds with Cobb and the other physicians. Both Murray and Cobb were actively involved in the budding psychoanalytic community, which solidified into a formal institute in 1933. Both, however, were asked to resign from the local psychoanalytic society and were not permitted to join the new Institute, as neither was recognized as having undergone a formal training analysis, a new pre-requisite for membership.²⁷ Neither hardly needed the psychoanalysts for verification of their professional status in the world and both allowed the purists to retreat into the world of their own meetings. Meanwhile, both Cobb and Murray colluded to continue to introduce psychoanalysis into the Harvard curriculum and to wrest control away from Vienna as to who would be the right and most qualified candidates to do so.

Murray was surrounded by both Freudians and Jungians, as the clinic became known as a center for psychotherapeutic research and at the cutting edge of dynamic theories of personality. It also quickly became a haven for brilliant, well-qualified women whose intelligence went unnoticed in the more male-dominated power circles involving dynamic psychology and psychiatry. Christiana Morgan, Cecelia Robertson (later Mrs. Walter Bogner), who first proposed the idea for the Thematic Apperception Test, Josephine Murray, MD, who was Murray's daughter, Cobb's wife, Elizabeth, Eleanor Jones, Esther Whitman, Ruth Peterson, and Maria Rickers-Ovsiankina, Kurt Lewin's former student from Berlin, were among them. Cobb similarly fostered the careers of numerous women in psychiatry and social work at a time when this was not the vogue, including Lucy Jessner, Jenny Velderhaus, Elizabeth Zetzel, and Eleanor Pavenstedt. Cobb had also contemplated a central role for Bill Herman in his new Department, but Herman died prematurely in 1935, much to Cobb's personal dismay.

Boring and Psychoanalysis

Boring himself underwent a psychoanalysis from September 1934 to June, 1935. He reported that he had had 168 analytic sessions—five every week, which he later described in an article “Was This Analysis a Success?”²⁸ He made almost every one of them. He wept. He threw things. He expressed a great deal of emotion. Four years later, however, he was still unable to assess the significance of his experience in ther-

apy. He entered therapy a psychologist committed to scientific productivity. Believing more in his persistence than any tendency toward genius, he worked an 80 hour week, 50 weeks of the year. He had already published his *A History of Experimental Psychology* (1929)²⁹ and with that behind him, started on *The Physical Dimension of Consciousness* (1933).³⁰ He then promptly fell into a deep emotional crisis. By his own account, he suffered from inattention. His thinking became autistic, and he felt an emotional disturbance that led him to believe he was depressed. He felt as if all his accomplishments lay behind him. His friends urged him to get help. So he turned to psychoanalysis. He rationalized that the analysis of an experimental psychologist might reveal some insightful cross-fertilizations.

After an aborted beginning with someone whom he disliked, he met Han Sachs, one of Freud's closest disciples, who had emigrated from Berlin to become the senior training analyst in Boston upon the departure of Franz Alexander for Chicago. He liked the man and thought they would get along well. Throughout the analysis, however, Boring felt an inadequacy of the basic theory itself. It seemed too loose and mixed volunteerism with determinism. He also felt he was unable to adequately establish a transference relationship with Sachs, the foundation on which all successful psychoanalysis is based. For this reason, he judged his analysis to be a failure. He also said they discovered no significant forgotten memories or any significant dreams.³¹

Many issues therefore went unresolved. These included Boring's relation to his mother and father; Titchener as the great father figure in Boring's life; and Boring's reputation as a historian rather than an experimentalist when he wanted to be seen as an experimentalist. And was it that Boring was driving himself too hard and just overworked? Or was Murray himself the cause of Boring's ulcer?

We know, however, that the analysis definitely had an effect on Boring. When Sachs went on vacation and returned to Europe for the summer, Boring had a panic attack. He desperately sought help and had nowhere to turn. So, he tried to contact Harry Murray. At the time, Murray was up at his cabin, vacationing on the St. Lawrence Seaway. He was being visited there by a number of colleagues, Erik Erikson among them, and also Murray's young teenage nephew, who later grew up to become a Unitarian minister in Williamsburg, Virginia. Discovering they were there, Boring drove up in his car. He was welcomed when he finally arrived. They were in the middle of a softball game. Invited to join them, although not an athletic person and not in that good a physical condition, Boring took off his shirt and played throughout the afternoon, sustaining a serious sunburn by nightfall. That night, after dinner, sitting around the living room, someone made the proposal to engage in a trivial pursuit-like game, where questions international in scope on a variety of subjects were posed to each participant. The one answering the most questions correctly was declared the winner. Murray reported that this was exactly the kind of game that Boring loved and in which he excelled, but Boring was so out of sorts that night that the teenage nephew soundly trounced him. The entire episode suggested that Boring had, after all, established a certain dependence on his therapist, whose unexpected absence drove him to desperate behavior and uncertain surges in emotion.

The Macropersonality Theorists

Besides Murray taking over the clinic, the other interesting event of 1930 was that Gordon Allport had returned to Harvard from Dartmouth, bringing graduate students such as Hadley Cantril with him. He reappeared ostensibly with Boring's blessing to assist in dismantling the old Department of Social Ethics and to assist in the establishment of a new Department of Sociology. Psychology was not yet a full-fledged Department in the University, but more a semi-independent concentration still operating under the Department of Philosophy, as it had been since William James's time. Boring knew that big changes were coming and Allport, he believed at the time, would make a good chair of psychology when it achieved its full independence.

Allport launched a pioneering research program in personality-social psychology. He studied traits, developed the Allport–Vernon–Lindsay Study of Values, and pioneered in the psychological study of newspapers and radio. He was also editor of the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* from 1937 to 1949, a co-founder of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, and in 1939, president of the American Psychological Association.

We should conjecture at this point on the historical relationship between depth psychology and social psychology in the history of personality theory. The question is an important one, because Allport showed signs of being able to amenably combine normative trait theory with depth psychology and also sociological theories of personality which posited cultural factors as the essential origin of personal identity. The formation of personal identity clearly originated in deep structures within the dynamic unconscious, according to the psychoanalysts, an interpretation that was soundly rejected by both the measurement-oriented trait theorists known as experimental social psychologists, and a new breed of radical socialist theorists in psychology at the other end of the political spectrum—we shall refer to them as socialist psychologists,—because many of them were involved with the populist causes of the 1930s.³²

Allport, for his part, known as a personality-social psychologist, produced one of the primary texts in personality theory during this period, further launching the field in the 1930s and marking it as an era of the macropersonality theorists—those who rejected a reductionistic science based in the laboratory behavior of the white rat and who argued instead for a science of the whole person. This text was Allport's *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (1937).³³

To begin with, Allport's move away from a strict trait theory was palpable. He gave, for instance, a hefty 15-page summary of Adler and Freud, relying mainly on Freud's then recently published *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1932–1933),³⁴ and interpretations of Freud by Franz Alexander and Ives Hendrick.³⁵ He did learn well from his brother Floyd's tack of reinterpreting dynamic concepts, except now, instead of the behaviorist manifesto we got in Allport's dissertation of 1922, brother Gordon wanted to establish a dynamic psychology beyond Freud that retained instincts, traits, and motives but reorganized them into a gestalt that remained a science but focused on the unique totality of the person.

Drawing on the distinction by Wilhelm Windelband, Allport said personality must always be idiographic, so the focus of the work would be on the single case, not the nomothetic—generalizations of large-scale sample sizes. He knew this was a bold statement to make in a discipline already gone berserk with large-scale statistical measurements. But he intended with his text to expand the horizons of psychology.

He began with historical definitions, and then turned to psychophysiology, learning, and the evolution of the self. He introduced his concept of the functional autonomy of motives—that is, the persistence of behaviors and traits beyond their original reinforcers—as a way to understand the mature personality as different from the same self that had been in the child's body.³⁶ In terms of the structure of personality, he introduced his own definition of traits and developed them into a theory leading to the unity of personality, relying on gestalt principles to identify the total person, which was greater than the sum of the parts. Four chapters on methods of assessment were followed by two chapters on our ability to judge people and the place of intuition in any kind of personality theory, which, such theory he said in the end, must be both empirical and intuitive.

The type of psychology that treats motives, which explains why people do what they do, he said, is called a dynamic psychology. It is not merely a descriptive psychology; it strikes for a cause and is therefore bolder than a psychology that endeavors merely to establish a mathematical function between a stimulus and a response. A dynamic psychology seeks to be more than a matter of coefficients of correlation; it seeks first and foremost a sound and adequate theory of the nature of human dispositions. Current dynamic theories cannot bear the weight of a single full bodied personality because they are too general, too abstract, and too rigid. William McDougall, Allport says, states that only instincts can be the prime movers, few in number, common in all men, and established at birth. The psychoanalysts hold the same over-simplified theory—all human motives are canalized into one basic sexual instinct. He then gave examples from Freud, Rank, Adler, Murray, and others. They all had in common the reduction of every elaborate and individual motive to a limited number of basic interests shared by all men and presumably innate. The fact that such dynamic theories are all so different attests to their failure to successfully describe the person and his or her unique individuality.

But how can you have a science of the unique? His answer was the theory of the functional autonomy of motives. The new dynamic psychology he proposed accounted for the infinitely varying living systems that define the person contemporaneously, even though they may have grown out of previous systems, which had served different purposes. Now, they are functionally independent of them.

Allport positioned James as a foundational source for Allport's own idea of functional autonomy. James spoke about the transitoriness of instincts, by which he meant one may appear, but once in a lifetime, whereupon it promptly disappears through its transformation into habits. The psychology of personality therefore must be a psychology of post-instinctive behavior. He also cited Robert Woodworth's idea of the transformation of "mechanisms" into "drives": "The fundamental drive toward a certain end may be hunger, sex, pugnacity or what not, but once the activity is started, the means to the end becomes an object of interest on its own account."³⁷

Allport also said that the same conception can be found in the writings of William Stern and E. C. Tolman. It was a principle of dynamic development, allowing room to describe and understand the person's growth toward mature selfhood and unity. He would later refer to this kind of psychology as a science of the person.

Two primary sources for understanding the whole person that he put forward in his text of 1937 were depth psychology and gestalt psychology. In his discussion of cardinal traits, for instance, Allport discussed congruence—that between the subjects' own perception of himself and the actual condition of the self, and also the observer's perception of the same thing. Concerning the concept of a root quality, called a *radix* by the gestalt theorist Max Wertheimer, Allport said:

The cardinal trait, or *radix*, has been represented in a slightly different way by Henry A. Murray under the title of unity-thema. According to this conception, too, the dominant tendencies of a life are said to derive from a single central dynamic principle, which if properly understood would explain the collaborating and the conflicting actions of the person. But according to Murray, the unity-thema often springs from fixations formed early in life, and can be accurately discovered only through psychoanalytic exploration. Here, then, is the principle of congruence from a Freudian rendering.³⁸

Surveying the methods for studying the whole person, Allport had liberalized his position tremendously since his dissertation in 1922. In addition to describing methods directly taken from dynamic theories of the unconscious, he associated all these with Morgan and Murray's "thematic apperception test," which he listed all under the same rubric of "Depth-analysis."³⁹

Specifically, the psychiatric interview, through questioning and listening, discovers "hidden motives and obscure sequences of behavior." It is often supplemented with auxiliary techniques, such as free association, dream analysis, hypnotism, and automatic writing. And to these more familiar methods, he said, may be added a "whole groups of ingenious techniques" for the analysis of fantasies, "which are considered by all depth psychologists to be of primary importance in the investigation of personality." These involve analyzing the content of day dreams, getting the subject to discuss favorite themes in plays, novels, and literature, the administration of word association tests, the method of free association, the induction of trance states, what he called similes tests, where the subject must give in three minutes all the similes he can think of to the phrase "as unhappy as . . ."; musical reverie tests, picture completion tests, word projection tests, and then Allport described the Thematic Apperception Test, being then still under construction by Christiana Morgan and Henry A. Murray. According to Allport, the ambiguous picture contains people in vague or suggestive situations the same age as the subject, who makes up a brief story based on the ambiguous stimuli in which he or she usually puts themselves in the role of the main character.

Allport's discussion of unity in personality also focused on gestalt psychology, not the unity of substructures as expressed in the writings of Wertheimer, Koffka, and Köhler. Instead, when considering whether or not personality as a whole is a gestalt, he chose the work of Lewin, particularly his *Principles of Topological Psychology* (1936), because Lewin said yes to the question "is a science of the whole

person possible?" and he supported it with his own experimental evidence. Allport said:

Personality, Lewin says in effect, is indeed a Gestalt, but it is a Gestalt that has greater or less unity, depending upon its own individual nature, upon the condition of the organism and the field in which it is behaving. Perhaps no other psychologist has succeeded quite so well at depicting at one in the same time so many of the intricate issues involved, and the unity of personality is always a matter of degree.⁴⁰

The key here for Allport was that the single case study is elevated to a position of highest respectability in psychological research. He questioned the use of the word *dynamic* in the title of Lewin's book, however. The relation of the individual to the environment is ever changing and therefore dynamic but, according to Allport, Lewin's topology cannot seem to explain stability over time especially in regard to unity of various levels of traits. Nevertheless "the topological treatment of unity is one of the most fruitful to be found in the entire literature of personality."⁴¹ Lewin most certainly would have listened attentively, and then asked permission to draw one of his J-curves, after which he would probably give a topological explanation of the subject.

For his part, in 1938, Murray, with the help of others at the clinic, produced his first major work on psychology, *Explorations in Personality: A Clinical and Experimental Study of Fifty Men of College Age* (1938).⁴² The official authors were "The Workers of the Harvard Psychological Clinic," whose names were then listed. There were 27 of them, including Murray's own. But history always records the book as his, which annoyed him. Among the more well known were Donald McKinnon, Nevitt Sanford, Erik Erikson, Saul Rosenzweig, William G. Barrett, Walter Langer, Christiana Morgan, Jerome Frank, Elizabeth Cobb, Merrill Moore, and Maria Rickers-Ovsiankina, to name only a few. Murray, himself, was listed as assistant professor of psychology.

No publisher would take the book until a subvention was offered with it and Murray's friend Felix Frankfurter made a few phone calls. Oxford Press finally published it. The work was dedicated to five individuals: to Morton Prince, who had the vision, raised the endowment, and was the clinic's first director; to Sigmund Freud, whose genius contributed the most fruitful working hypotheses; to Lawrence J. Henderson, whose exposition of scientific procedure established a methodological standard; to Alfred North Whitehead, whose philosophy of the organism supplied the necessary underlying generalities; and finally, to Carl G. Jung, "whose writings were a hive of great suggestiveness." This wording was quintessential Murray.

So it was not just a collection of articles. Murray defined the procedure for achieving unity among individual investigators: all experimenters studied the same 50 subjects with the same concepts actively in mind and then in assembly, a meeting being devoted in each case, to report findings toward a common purpose—the formulation of the personality of every subject. He called this kind of research a Jeffersonian democracy, because of the freedom each investigator coveted and so was given. The conditions under which the subjects were studied were as much as possible those of everyday life. They employed the Lewinian model, Murray said:

responses of subjects were compared under two different conditions and the results compared for normative responses as well as deviations, and of what kind, thus capturing the whole of the groups' responses as well as those of the individual subjects, rather than just a statistical take on one or two variables. This was a book, in other words, based on Galilean and not Newtonian science.

The 50 subjects became the most studied subjects in the history of psychology. Everything that could possibly be known about them was collected. They were measured with tests, their unconscious was probed with free associations, and they were repeatedly interviewed over a 3-year period. As the data rolled in, it became obvious that the investigators needed to construct out of all this an adequate framework for defining personality. Each investigator was asked to give up some of their independence for the sake of the larger agenda. Murray admitted that in the end they never did really succeed in merging their respective ideologies:

How could such a thing come to pass in a group composed of poets, physicists, sociologists, anthropologists, criminologists, physicians: of democrats, fascists, communists, anarchists; of Jews, Agnostics, Atheists; of pluralists, monists, solipsists; of behaviourists, configurationists, dynamicists, psychoanalysts; of Freudians, Jungians, Rankians, Adlerians, Lewinians, and Allportians?⁴³

All these vagaries, he said, were expressed somewhere through the book. He then indicated in so many words that the orientation of the book was primarily psychodynamic:

In our explorations we attempted to get below the social derm of personalities. Indeed, we became so bent upon the search for covert springs of fantasy and action that we slighted necessarily some of the more obvious and common phases of behaviour. This has resulted in a certain distortion which may seem great to those whose vivid experiences are limited to what is outwardly perceived and public, to what is rational and consciously intended.⁴⁴

In the very beginning he was absolutely clear about the point of view adopted in the book—"that personalities constitute the subject matter of psychology, the live history of a single man being a unit with which this discipline has to deal."⁴⁵ He realized that he was deviating from the custom in academic psychology to concentrate almost completely on the perceptive and cognitive functions of the organism or more recently the behavior of animals. He was intent here on not only defining the field of personality, but on setting nothing less than a new course for psychology.

Regarding psychoanalysis, Murray cited examples from Freud, claimed that the interpretations of the personologists were liberal but not as liberal as that of the psychoanalysts, and he quoted Jung directly on matters of differing interpretation among scientists. Attempting to bring order to the budding field of personology, the clinic team drew on McDougall's classification of propensities, or driving instinctual forces, rather than the Freudian list of basic instincts. When looking at dimensions, functions, vectors, modes, or traits, they followed "heavily" Jung, Stern, and Allport. When they were concerned with genesis, history, and development they followed both the work of Pavlov and the gestalt psychologists, "and by such psychoanalytic concepts as fixation, substitution, compensation, sublimation, and regression."⁴⁶ In defining their theory of the total personality they desired to proceed according to

certain principles. Murray then gave a footnote of acknowledgment to L. J. Henderson, who was then teaching the sociology of Vilfredo Pareto in the Sociology Department.

He also had an entire section in the introduction in which he compared the method of the clinic to the psychoanalysts and the academic personologists, by which he said that he meant Allport. Most psychoanalyses take 200 hours; the clinic's subjects were studied for a total of about thirty-five 1-hour sessions, of which about 5 hours were devoted to the recovery of past experiences; their viewpoint was also not one sided, so the subject did not get tangled up in the personality of the therapist; plus the relation between consciousness and the unconscious can be seen in a greater relief because of the addition of the social emphasis; the clinic also focused on relatively normal subjects, while the psychoanalysts usually dealt with more neurotic types; also, small as the subject sample was, the clinic staff was able to study individual differences; they were also not averse to employing experimental methods, which psychoanalysts usually did not do. Nevertheless, he stated, critical though we may be, "we are not unmindful of the fact that from the start it [psychoanalysis] has been our most constant guide and source of illumination. Without it these studies would never have been planned or finished." From Allport, on the other hand, they derived much in respect to "orderly method of procedure and proper statistical treatment of our findings."

Thus, Murray concluded:

Our work is the natural child of the deep, significant, metaphorical, provocative, and questionable speculations of psychoanalysis and the precise, systematic, statistical, trivial, and artificial methods of academic personology. Our hope is that we have inherited more of the virtues than the vices of our parents.⁴⁷

Murray then set out to outline the proposal for a theory of personality, drawing on the works of William McDougall, E. C. Tolman, a heavy emphasis on Kurt Lewin, a smattering of Köhler, Erikson, Skinner, and James, then a good deal of Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung (Murray spelt introversion and extraversion correctly), and Alfred Adler, but mainly Freud. After a description of the variables of personality, the ability to judge persons, a discussion of child development, and the methods of testing the subjects, he and his co-authors finished with the detailed analysis of a single subject, the Case of Ernest, which was actually contributed by Robert White. It was a *tour de force* that launched a new generation of personality theorists, the lineage of which continues, altho somewhat dissipated today.

Meanwhile, Cobb had been busy launching psychoanalysis at the Harvard Medical School. The Department of Psychiatry at the Massachusetts General Hospital had been launched in 1934, effectively elevating liaison psychiatry in a general hospital setting to a new status within psychiatry. The Rockefeller money supported the project, paid salaries, administrative costs, and the alteration of infrastructure to get the Department started. Entirely new, he said, was that for the first time, Rockefeller money included underwriting a certain number of beds for patient care at the MGH and also the cost of psychoanalysis for young medical residents. Two of these included Jock Murray and Walter Kauffman, men who would rise to the top of the

profession during the war years and help in determining the course of psychiatry in subsequent decades. This included marrying psychoanalysis to the programs of the Veterans Administration, which led to an unprecedented era of psychoanalytic influence in the clinical teaching and practice of psychology and psychiatry. That influence lasted into the late 1960s.⁴⁸

The political payoff for Murray was also soon realized when Murray's academic appointment came up for review in 1938. The examining committee consisted of Boring, Lashley, two Deans, Allport, and Cobb.⁴⁹ President Conant assembled the group together in his office for the first time just to get acquainted and conversation went back and forth somewhat informally about Murray. At one point Allport said that he thought he was the most important psychologist at Harvard since William James. Lashley was aghast at such a statement and immediately rose to proclaim that, to the contrary, William James was the biggest mistake to have happened to Harvard and to psychology. Voices rose in both contradiction and agreement at once and an uproar was eminent. Conant seized the moment to rise himself and suggest that the meeting be adjourned, but that they all shake hands before leaving, so the meeting would end on a positive note.

The evaluation took much longer than expected—2 years. In the final decision, there were three votes against—Boring, Lashley and one of the Deans, and three votes in favor, Cobb, Allport, and the other Dean. Conant broke the tie in favor of Murray, because Cobb had presciently gone back to the Rockefeller Foundation and gotten them to commit more money to the Harvard Psychological Clinic, if Murray was permitted to stay.

The only caveat was that Murray was not granted tenure and not awarded a full professorship, thus ameliorating somewhat the reaction of the naysayers. At the same time, Lashley, who had in the beginning been recruited as one of the world's great physiological psychologists, was able to retain his faculty position at Harvard, but as a research professor who drifted away toward the Yerkes Primate Research Center and ceased to be a force in the Department. Such was the fate of the man who vilified James. True, James was only a sometime laboratory psychologist, but a beloved figure nonetheless in the pantheon of Harvard professors whose reputation had reached mythic proportions in the history of the University.

Ross Stagner and The Murphys

Meanwhile, during this time, the field of personality was blooming. Three other early pioneers in this work were Ross Stagner, and Gardner and Lois Murphy. The same year that Allport produced his text, Stagner, Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Akron, produced his *Psychology of Personality* (1937), a study of normal personality development rather than abnormal psychology.⁵⁰ The work also included a chapter on personality and culture by Abraham Maslow.

Stagner decided that traits should not be confused with types because traits could be precisely measured while types were general orientations that broke down under minute analysis. In this he broke with the gestaltists, such as Lewin, who advocated

studying the ideal type as more instructive for seeing variations in real-life situations. He did advocate studying the total personality, however, which could be done by analysis of the single case at a point in time, or more dynamically, along three dimensions: the individual in relation to disease, the study of normal development, and the study of personality as an expression of its cultural milieu. This approach stands in contrast to trait theory, which asks the person to answer a list of questions, the results of which are factored into fixed tendencies, the sum total of which is never really calculated.

He also devoted an entire section to the dynamics of personality, in which he considered appetites and aversions, the theories of Freud, Adler, and Lewin, and the cultural interpretation of motivation. Appetites and aversions had been avoided by philosophers interested in psychology since the time of Aristotle and Aurelius, focusing instead on the rational aspects of humans, which made them neglect the irrational side. This side reveals motivation in the form of conscious and unconscious drives. Tabooed appetites can then also be studied, as well as what motivates learning, all of which constitutes the dynamics of personality.

Stagner then presented three such dynamic theories. Freud has been misunderstood for many reasons, not the least of these is the mistranslation of certain words such as lust, instinct, and libido. He then reviewed the basic ideas of Freudian theory, commenting on the pleasure principle, the reality principle, repetition compulsions, and the like. It took him five full pages to mention the word sex, which he then skipped over in favor of a further discussion of behavior shaped by the Id, Ego, and Superego. After ten pages of rhetoric, he finally got into psychosexual stages of development and the Oedipus phase, concluding that sexual factors remain Freud's most important contribution to a dynamic study of personality.

Stagner's treatment of Adler is much shorter. He mistakenly called Adler a student of Freud and then proceeded to explicate his theory. The life plan of the person is formulated in response to perceived organ inferiority and its compensation. The environment is mastered by the will to power in order to overcome inferiority. Social norms require the perfect masculine form, prowess, strength, and mastery, which in the inferior individual are experienced as "the masculine protest." While apparently built on a negative epistemology, Adler's theory had great success in helping school children overcome feelings of inferiority while learning successively how to assert themselves at a young age.

Kurt Lewin's dynamic of theory of personality then came in for treatment in a section even shorter than Adler's. Lewin's theory, Stagner said, is based on two fundamental concepts: external valence, the demand characteristics of objects in the environment, and internal tension, which builds with unfulfilled needs. The child in infancy who pushes things out of the crib will later learn to push things under the rug, which may later develop into the predilection to hide things, then to lying behavior. A common need or tension persists in each example which requires expression and determines behavior. Tensions can also be task specific. Zeigarnik noted that when subjects were given tasks to perform, where some were allowed to finish and others not, then asked to remember the whole set of tasks, most often they reported thinking about the unfinished ones. Rickers-Ovsiankina employed the

same tasks but allowed the subjects to go back and play with them during a free time at the end. Subjects almost always returned to the unfinished tasks. Goals may also be substituted for one another, providing they are similar and the replacement is not more difficult. Stagner noted in conclusion that, in typical gestalt fashion, these studies emphasized the here-and-now, while Freud and Adler required delving into the subjects' past. All were designed to get at dynamic sources of motivation. The final third of the book emphasized social and cultural determinates shaping personality.

Stagner did not actually have the stature in psychology or the reputation already garnered by personality theorists such as Murray and Allport, but his legacy has demanded attention by prominent psychologists such as the late Ernest Hilgard nonetheless. The suggestion is that Stagner was actually less controversial among later experimentalists and for that reason probably more accepted.

Gardner and Lois Murphy

Despite the fact that they were an integral part of the Murray-Allport circle, two early personality-social psychologists similarly shunted to the wayside by historians or cut up piecemeal by those who took only parts of their psychology were Gardner and Lois Murphy. Lois was best known for her work in child psychology and psychoanalysis, while Gardner was not only a major player as a personality theorist but also a distinguished parapsychologist, a fact conveniently often dropped from his biography because both mainstream interpreters and younger human science scholars cannot bear to associate themselves with what they assuredly label the occult and the unscientific, when they know absolutely nothing about these subjects or the history of their scientific study.

Gardner Murphy was born in 1895 and died in 1979.⁵¹ During his early life he spent several years in Concord, Massachusetts, and for that episode now lies buried next to his wife Lois in Sleepy Hollow Cemetery, next to Authors' Ridge, where Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne, and the Alcotts rest. He took his undergraduate degree at Yale and from 1916 to 1917 went to Harvard to earn the MA in psychology. Robert Mearns Yerkes, who was teaching there, became his lifelong friend. Murphy later recounted that he took uninspired courses from Herbert S. Langfeld, Hugo Münsterberg, and Edwin B. Holt. But he remained eclectic. Murphy was simultaneously enrolled in physiological psychology, history of religions, and philosophy. One result, he renounced the Episcopalianism of his family. He became an ethical humanist, more at home with the Quaker meeting than a High Mass. But it was psychical research that captivated his imagination. As a boy, he had been introduced to the subject in his Grandpa King's library when he found a copy of Sir William Barrett's *Psychical Research*⁵² and devoured it in its entirety, and he was familiar with William James's famous case of the medium, Mrs. Leonora Piper, as Grandpa King was her lawyer. But the scientific study of the paranormal did not suggest itself to him directly until he began to work with Leonard Troland at Harvard. Troland drew him into the experimental method and the two entered into

laboratory investigations that launched Murphy for the rest of his career into the field of what J. B. Rhine later called parapsychology, despite the fact that Murphy became best known as a personality-social psychologist. Along with Murphy, Troland also involved George Estabrooks, and the young graduate student, Harry Helson.

While at Harvard, Murphy also was drawn into subjects such as esthetics and beauty, and he learned Freudian psychoanalysis as well as Jamesean pragmatism and the philosophy of Henri Bergson.⁵³ These were his entry into psychodynamic psychology, which became foundational to his later theory of personality. And although they lived in completely different worlds, Murphy, the struggling graduate student, and Murray, the flamboyant coxswain on the rowing team, Murray had just left Harvard a year before Murphy was there. Allport, however, Murphy must have actually known from those early days, as Allport was a sophomore from 1916 to 1917, and in the same environment in which everyone pretty much knew everyone else.

On Meeting Gordon Allport

According to Lois, however, she and Gardner first met Allport at the Hanover Conference on Personality and Culture in 1930, just as Allport was returning to Harvard from 4 years at Dartmouth. Their subsequent meetings, according to Lois, always emphasized Allport's work on gestalt psychology. At the same time, Allport's *Studies in Expressive Movement* (1933)⁵⁴ reinforced Murphy's appreciation for the contribution the experimental approach could make to personality. Allport, for his part, visited them in their home in Brooklyn, traveled to see them on several occasions to their summer home, Birchlea, in New Hampshire, and endlessly discussed personality and social psychology and how to help the fleeing Jewish refugees, such as Werner Wolff. As well, Allport could not speak highly enough of Murphy's writing style.

Lois maintained that she and Gardner first met Henry A. Murray at Harvard in 1936, at a meeting of Kurt Lewin's topological psychology group. They developed a lasting friendship with Murray, visiting with him at meetings of the American Psychological Association, and they corresponded and read each others' writings throughout the years that followed. Murray himself visited them in New Hampshire, as Allport and others had done, and Murray came to see Murphy in Washington, DC, during his final illness.⁵⁵

Murphy, with the help of Friedrich Jensen, an MD from Freiberg-im-Breisgau, and John Levy, a New York psychoanalyst who also taught at Columbia, also produced one of the earliest texts in personality psychology, *Approaches to Personality: Some Contemporary Conceptions Used in Psychology and Psychiatry*, first published in 1932.⁵⁶ The work was based on what Murphy described as a "polydimensional eclecticism" and was likely a more accurate reflection of the American temper, which is at once pragmatic, eclectic, and more optimistically oriented than the texts that followed. The later texts tried to paint the picture of psychology as science unified around reductionistic empiricism and trait theory, where personality

psychology largely remains today. Under “Experimental Psychology,” gestalt theory, the French and American schools of dissociation, and Russian and American theories of conditioned learning were considered. The second section considers the psychodynamic theories of Freud, Jung, and Adler, while the final section presents the study of personality from the standpoint of child guidance. The focus throughout is on the individual case study and the genetic method, by which the authors meant to refer to developmental stages across the life span, but with a particular emphasis on the early years of development. Levy, in particular, equated the study of personality with understanding the “total behavior” of the child.

Murphy and Lewin

This was also the time that the Murphys first met Kurt Lewin. Lewin arrived from Germany just after their book *Experimental Social Psychology*⁵⁷ was published in 1931. Murphy wrote that Lewin “cut a meteoric flight through our experience of personality-social research. . .from 1932 until his death in 1947.”⁵⁸ He first met Lewin at the Columbia University Faculty Club in 1932 and he was immediately struck, not only by Lewin’s new methods but also the kind of new leadership that he represented that would soon be guiding the development of experimental-social psychology. Both Gardner and Lois recognized that Lewin had not yet quite worked out his field theory, but it was obviously so close to what they were doing that they were immediately attracted to it. They joined the topological psychology group on two occasions, when Margaret Mead, Edward C. Tolman, Kurt Koffka, and Erikson were there as well. At one point, Murphy copied Lewin’s style to develop his own version of field theory for an APA address delivered in 1946. Murphy, along with Horace Kallen, also tried to get Lewin a position at the New School for Social Research, but was effectively blocked by Wolfgang Kohler, who had always considered Lewin an outsider from the true circle of gestaltists.

But Murphy also differed with Lewin on many points. He complained that Lewin would only work with a cross-section of behavior, not with a history of how the behavior came into being. He also felt that Lewin had not shown the non-utility of breaking the whole into clarifiable parts and that he neglected a psychology of individual differences. Nor had he shown how his ellipses were related to mathematics or statistics. Nevertheless, Gardner Murphy proclaimed, “Lewinian theory was rapidly elevated to a position of great importance.”

The Princeton Conference on Personality and Gestalt Psychology

Gestalt psychology was a growing dynamic force behind the scenes as the new field of personality psychology began to blossom in full force in the 1930s. One example was the Conference on Personality Development and Gestalt Psychology, held on January 18, 19, and 20, 1935, at Princeton University. Originally called by

Lawrence Frank,⁵⁹ head of the General Education Board of the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fund, the conference was designed to identify significant concepts in gestalt psychology for understanding the problem of development in personality. It was Frank's conviction that no orderly system of development had yet been worked out for personality, in spite of widespread interest in the problem. Psychoanalysts were a possible exception, probably because they operated within a closed theoretical system, but psychologists were seldom satisfied that Freud's theories held the entire story. Gestalt psychology appeared to have numerous contacts with the subject of personality and the conference was convened, Frank said, to get these connections in better perspective. He specifically pointed out that the experts that had been invited included "all leading gestalt visitors" and some Americans, but no psychoanalysts.

Those in attendance included Gordon Allport from Harvard University; W. E. Blatz from the University of Toronto; Barbara Burks from the Child Development Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University; Mrs. Mary Fisher from Sarah Lawrence College; Kurt Koffka, then at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts; Wolfgang Köhler, who was then visiting faculty at Harvard University; Kurt Lewin, then at Cornell; Norman Maier from the University of Michigan; Mark May from Yale; Gardner and Lois Murphy from Columbia University; Willard Olson from the University of Michigan; George Stoddard from the State University of Iowa; and Max Wertheimer, who was at that time at the New School for Social Research in New York City.

Gordon Allport's typewritten notes from the event indicted that, like many such conferences, this one was slow in getting started. Frank opened the conference with an eloquent quotation from L. L. Thurstone,⁶⁰ advocating a longitudinal, genetic, and psychiatric approach to personality, which was not based on cross-sectional research. The point Frank appeared to be making to Allport was that Americans allow nature to slip out of their hands by their one-sided and narrow-minded use of cross-sectional, quantitative methodology.

Allport described the initial interactions as "some preliminary skirmishing to find out what the cardinal problem for discussion should be." In a separate insertion with an ink pen, Allport noted the general conclusion to be "what is the genetic problem in the psychology of personality." Here he has crossed out "psychological," opting for "genetic," indicating that the issue to be discussed was the overall problem of the psychological development of the person over the life span.

As the Chairman, Frank proposed that the answer was a problem of "Becoming," a key concept in his developmental theory of how children learn and what social scientists ought to be studying. To the idea of becoming, Allport wryly noted in his notes, "Becoming organized (including, of course, disorganized)." The various combatants then weighed in. W. E. Blatz from the University of Toronto objected to Frank's characterization as seeming to overemphasize formal education over experience. Blatz's position was that learning that is important for personality has no relation to academic learning, particularly when expressed in terms such as frequency and recency. Growth that takes place from traumatic experiences would be closer

to the actual case of experiential learning. Wertheimer jumped in and emphasized the point that, from the perspective of gestalt psychology, learning depends on personality, rather than determining it. Maier from Michigan thought of organization of personality in terms of individuation and equivalence of stimuli, which sounded to Allport like "a kind of situational identical element theory." Throughout the conversation, Allport noted, "this dispute persisted," referring to whether personality depended on the organization within the person, or organization of the environment. Allport also noted that at the beginning, a certain amount of skepticism that things would ever gel hung in the air, although this markedly diminished later on in the conference.

Kohler, whom Allport characterized as "the bad boy of the conference," then asserted that psychology was not ripe for the study of personality. We are not sure what this means, but it almost certainly refers to the maturity of psychology as an experimental science, being at that moment too atomistic and reductionist, and narrow in methodology to grasp the bigger picture of human functioning. He also expressed the view, "reminding one of Watson," Allport notes, that nothing is innate in personality except biological qualities. Allport later went back and decided in a penned addition that this was a "decidedly contrary consideration."

Lawrence Frank commented that he too also despaired of the strictly scientific approach, because no single variable can be interpreted in one unequivocal way. There is all manner of construction surrounding the same facts. A variable secured still names all manner of things. One of the Murphys chimed in that we cannot even adequately measure the environment, let alone personality, which depends on the environment and other things as well. Allport characterized them all as situationists, especially Frank, the Murphys, and Stoddard, most of whom were pessimistic, simply because they had not distinguished the environment from the person. He noted that "one does get dizzy when the two are combined." Also, he noted that everyone at least agreed to the point that some behavior may be due to different causes. "Hence, the problem of cause and effect becomes immensely confused." But, in spite of the original skepticism, the conference finally got down to work.

Allport noted that "abstract discussion got nowhere." In spite of the chairman's rhetoric, there continued to be a lot of general demand to hear concrete reports of investigations. A discussion then ensued after Olson from Michigan presented data from a study that attempted to predict delinquency among 3,000 children in which teacher's ratings were compared to judges' disposition of cases. Allport noted that the results showed teachers and judges seemed to have similar prejudices. Olson thought the study to be a gestalt investigation because of the global scoring used. Koffka, Wertheimer, and Lewin each pointed out faults with that point of view. Generally, it was considered macroscopic, when gestalt studies tended to be much more microscopic with regard to prediction. Kohler then interjected a comment that Allport noted was "shocking as usual." He said we definitely need the large scale as well as the atomistic point of view. "Facts are always acceptable to Gestalt." In any case, he advised them all to leave Olson alone. Olson was describing a "nice, typical, American problem," Kohler said. It was "Good common sense American psychology." Lewin added that one must know what aggressiveness is to the child.

Persistence may vary but it was always persistence. He gave the example of a child always giving a tool away is just as persistent a mode of conduct as always keeping it. In general, however, it was clear to Allport that “Gestalt does not recognize a nomographic method (or pooling variables) as a Gestalt method.”

As the conference progressed, Professor Stoddard of Iowa observed four special points that were emerging for him: the importance of case histories, interest in ascendance and submission, types of change in personality, and the gestalt approach to a good interview.

Concerning case histories, he particularly noted the case history of one child, connected with the work of A. R. Lauria, which seemed to indicate that numerous problems in the child could be traced to a single root—the fact that the mother was a prostitute. In this particular case, all problems, affective organization, and mental content “derived therefrom.” Stoddard appeared to be speaking generally on this point, as Allport noted “this though Stoddard did not recognize it, a decidedly agreeable conception to Gestalt.”

Stoddard also thought there was “much interest in ascendance submission. He had found in several studies that it was possible to change submission but not ascendance. Why?” Allport’s notes ask in answer: “difficult to find situations that encourage a submissiveness in training?” He felt there was a wrong emphasis here on the situation. He referred to Köhler’s idea that we strive to “maximize the ego at all times?” That submission is a form of life most easily admitted in our culture? Or was this trend a function of biological drives?

Regarding types of change in personality, Stoddard contrasted the sudden with the gradual. Re-education should be gradual, especially when we are confronted with the person’s statement that it does not feel right to do things in a new way. Allport then noted Stoddard’s point that “even sudden re-orientation may require long preparation.” Finally, Stoddard noted a defining idea for interviewing, namely, “Never put in a question on blind hope. Always have a hypothesis for every question, or leave it out.”

There was much more, but suffice it to say that the gestaltists and the personality theorists were melding behind the scenes, even as the founders of the gestalt lineage were being welcomed by the laboratory experimentalists in American universities, but not really permitted to get a foothold. The core of experimental psychology at Harvard was, after all, Wundtian. Psychology as a whole embraced the gestaltists to the extent that it absorbed most of their major constructs, such as the relation between figure and ground, insight learning, isomorphism, and the concept of *Gestalten* itself, into the flow of what was taught as introductory, general psychology. But the gestaltists themselves were never able to successfully challenge the American experimentalists directly, and their potential as a significant movement soon dissipated. Gestalt psychology did continue to have a significant impact within the community of the macropersonality theorists, and then flourished in the American psychotherapeutic counterculture in the 1960s around Fritz and Laura Perls and Fritz’s controversial decision to call his approach gestalt therapy. A more direct example of the influence of gestalt psychology on personality theory, however, was Lewin at Harvard.

Lewin at Harvard

In 1931, Lewin had proposed his famous distinction between Aristotelian and Galilean modes of thought in psychological science.⁶¹ He asked, “Is it possible to find general laws that apply to the individual? Can we determine general laws and at the same time do precise experiments on individual emotional life? Is it possible to study and explain inner emotional processes as quantitatively and objectively as physics has done in its own realm?”

Lewin’s position was that large-scale samples are not needed to find general laws. Such laws can be found in the concrete example of the single case. To this idea, Lewin added that, yes, general laws can be known from the single case, but only if the case is known in its totality. This point marked Galileo’s historic break with Aristotle.

Aristotelian ways of thinking were static. They broke phenomena up into their opposites—light dark, good—bad, black—white. Galilean thinking on the other hand considered the opposites to lie along an unbroken continuum. Psychology, too, must adopt the dynamic conception of sequence instead of the static concept of paired opposites. The Aristotelian standard for establishing laws required many repetitions that were predictable and orderly so that validity can be established. The Galilean required only that the phenomenon actually be observed; how many times were not important. This would mean that psychology would have to become more like astronomy or oceanography, where single events were not only legitimate, but the key to understanding the nature of real life. It was not the frequency of occurrence that was decisive, but the exact description of all the forces acting in the present, both inner needs and from the outward environment. Behavior can be known and predicted, but only if the total psychological field has been defined. Large-scale samples miss these dimensions of the total person and the total field because they only deliver information about one or two aspects of the whole, not the totality of the person and the situation itself.

The Galilean was essentially Murray’s approach to the multivariate study of the concrete individual simultaneously at many different levels of complexity. It was also Allport’s emphasis on individual personality as a total gestalt. The piece was widely read and contributed to Lewin’s growing international reputation.

The Topology Club met annually at different Universities. In 1936 it met at Harvard, where both Murray and Allport gave papers. The meeting was also attended by among others, David Shakow, Donald McKinnon, David Kretch, Ruth Benedict, Tamara Dembo, Harold Lasswell, and Gardner Murphy.⁶² At one point, Morrow reports that Lewin and Murray were both at the blackboard comparing both their systems, chalk dust everywhere. Murray suddenly exclaimed, but how with this maze of lines and cross hatchings can you represent qualitatively different motives, vectors, and goals? Lewin’s humorous reply was that he would simply employ different colors of chalk.

Gardner Murphy remembered being captivated by the charm and the convenience of Lewin’s broad conceptualizations and graphic displays. Murphy went on to attempt to describe his own version of field theory at the 1936 meeting of the

American Psychological Association. He felt that the conception of psychological space needed to be worked out further and that Lewin might sometimes be obscuring the person's idiosyncratic life space with what was actually the sociological space around him.⁶³

Donald McKinnon, one of Murray's students, wrote that when he was at Harvard in the 1920s, psychologists had good experimental methods, but they were applying them to insignificant problems, while the psychoanalysts were dealing with real-life situations but their methods were inadequate. McKinnon wanted to build a bridge between the two, and when he discovered Lewin, he thought he had found someone already doing just that. Lewin was not interested in psychoanalysis, however, but he was vitally involved with dynamic problems of motivation. McKinnon traveled to Berlin to work with him. Karl Zener and Donald Adams had preceded him. Jerome Frank also came from Harvard and joined Lewin's inner circle.

Morrow, Lewin's biographer, reports that Lewin spent two spring terms at Harvard, one in 1938 and the other in 1939. He spent most of his time with Murray over at the Harvard Psychological Clinic, where he held his seminars. He rejected the Department's main focus on the elegant experiment, because an artificial emphasis on operationism was always superimposed in between the experimenter and the subject. Lewin preferred instead the realities of everyday life and the freedom from constraint he found at the clinic. But Morrow also reports that Lewin was on good terms with everyone, including Boring, Stevens, and Lashley. He described Allport as a good friend. Allport was interested in Lewin giving greater consideration to attitudes, and, if we are to believe Morrow's claim, he wanted Lewin to incorporate more psychoanalytic concepts into his system. Allport recalled later that Lewin would always listen thoughtfully, and then draw one of his *j* curves. He might then incorporate the thought into his own system by way of expanding his own theories rather than taking on the theories of others. During the Harvard seminars Lewin met several investigators who later began to work closely with him, including Mason Haire, Jack French, Dorwin Cartwright, John Harding, and Eliot Jacques. Lewin wanted to be invited to Harvard, but Morrow described him as so different from Allport and so similar to Murray that difficulties continually abounded between them, though they were always quite friendly.

Lewin returned to Iowa, where he headed his own research team and encountered the Harvard researchers again through the Office of Special Services and the Office for Naval Research. Murray, for his part, employed Lewin's research approach again in *The Assessment of Men*,⁶⁴ which was the training program Murray and his colleagues designed to select and prepare secret operatives to be dropped behind enemy lines in Europe. Lewin made close contact again with Murray and Allport later after the War, when he founded the MIT Center for Group Dynamics in 1946, employing numerous colleagues from his Iowa days, such as Leon Festinger. The program at the Center was to be completely new, focused on the dynamics of groups as a whole. Action theory was to underpin its methods. The Center was situated in the Department of Economics and Social Sciences and had little regard for disciplinary boundaries. They quickly established close relations with Allport and Murray at Harvard and shared graduate students under a long-standing arrangement between the two

Universities allowing students to cross-reference courses. The Center worked on group productivity, group communications, social perception, intergroup relations, group membership and individual adjustment, and finally the improvement of group functioning.

Boring Performs a Commissurotomy on Psychology

Meanwhile, the same year Lewin developed his Center at MIT, one of the single most important events in the history of academic psychology in the 20th century took place when the split occurred in Psychology at Harvard. The measurement-oriented laboratory men became the Department of Psychology, strictly so-called, while personality, abnormal, social, and clinical joined with similar dissidents in cultural anthropology and sociology to form the new Department of Social Relations.

The reason for its importance was its effect on higher learning in psychology in the United States. President Conant was certainly aware of the tensions in the various departments of the social sciences and assembled a blue ribbon commission to examine the status of psychology and make recommendations. The Chair was Alan Greg, then director for the Medical Sciences at the Rockefeller Foundation. Other members included Chester I. Bernard, President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company; Detlev Bronk, Johnson Professor of Biophysics at the University of Pennsylvania; Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts University; John Dollard, professor of social anthropology at Yale; Thomas French, associate director of the Institute for Psychoanalysis, Chicago; Ernest Hilgard, professor of psychology at Stanford; Walter S. Hunter, professor of psychology at Brown University; Edward L. Thorndike, professor of psychology, *emeritus*, Teachers College, Columbia; Louis L. Thurstone, Charles F. Grey Distinguished Service Professor of Psychology, University of Chicago; John C. Whitehorn, Henry Phipps Professor of Psychiatry and Psychiatrist in Chief, Johns Hopkins University; and Robert M. Yerkes, professor of psychobiology, *emeritus*, Yale University.

The Commission was appointed May 1945 but the formal report was not issued until 1947. The project had definitely evolved from one of assessing the status of psychology at Harvard, through to the ideal status of psychology in a university, to finally the main consideration of the Commission's Report as stated in its title, *The Place of Psychology in an Ideal University* (1947).⁶⁵ The reason for this was that psychology cannot be considered in a vacuum, and to describe its place as a separate discipline also infused throughout various other disciplines in the University required the Commission to step back and look at the structure of the University as a whole.

Their definition of psychology was brilliant. Psychology is what psychologists actually do and teach. But they then limited their definition to "the science of human and animal behavior, both individual and social."⁶⁶ But then they expanded on even that definition: "psychology is the systematic study, by any and all applicable and fruitful methods, of organisms in relation to their behavior, environmental relations, and experience." Even so, such a psychology made up of purely intuitive and

imaginative perceptions was not amenable to experimental verification or validation by way of prediction. The discipline is instead hierarchical, studying the most elementary phenomena first, and then working up to the more complex. The majority of the committee wanted to place psychology as one of the biological sciences, but several dissenters were permitted to make their views known in initialized footnotes. In this case, several maintained that exploratory tendencies and novel hypotheses and an open-ended attitude toward radically new methods, procedures, and problems were essential to the acquisition of new knowledge, especially since many advances are made at the borderlines of conventionally defined disciplines.

Personality they considered a subset of clinical psychology. Social psychology they agonized over as to whether it should be taught in psychology or sociology. Experimentation and controlled observation are the touchstones of scientific psychology, but not all of science relies on the experimental method—astronomy, for instance. They recognized that science does not start with experimentation. “Too great concentration on experimentation may involve costly oversights, for experiment is not the beginning of science nor yet its only cachet of respectability.”⁶⁷ There are effective clinical methods to consider. The anamnesis—the story of the illness as told by the patient, or the life history, are methods that supply important information.

Their conclusion had several parts. First, they believed that “arrangements that encourage the exclusive domination of psychology by the laboratory would sacrifice the unity of the subject, belie its freedom, and limit its opportunity.”⁶⁸ Second, their solution was to allow the central department, no matter how small, to decide on its own focus of specialization, but to have every other psychologist in the university of whatever kind have a courtesy appointment on the faculty of that Department.

However, as the committee deliberated, the Armed Forces were beginning demobilization, and the rush to solve the problem at Harvard became acute before the arrival of waves of returning students. So, while the blue ribbon panel eventually recommended fusion of the various parts of psychology as a discipline throughout the ideal University, Harvard moved under Boring’s leadership to effect a fission—a splitting apart of the experimental and “social” theorists, which actually was perceived as the separation of the experimental and clinical traditions—the hard from the soft sciences in psychology. And while few universities rushed out and formed their own Department of Social Relations, the effect of the severance was that the experimentalists in the laboratories consolidated their control over psychology departments throughout the United States, while the clinicians were simply forced to go elsewhere. In Harvard’s case it was into the Department of Social Relations. By the 1970s clinical psychology had gone to the School of Education, and after that, out of the University’s School of Arts and Sciences altogether.⁶⁹

Along with Allport and Murray, there was Murray’s friend, Clyde Kluckhohn, cultural theorist, specialist in Navaho witchcraft, eminent teacher to successive generations of Harvard students, famed American long rider, and according to Talcott Parsons, certainly one of the most notable anthropologists of the 20th century. Kluckhohn first encountered the Navaho while at a ranch in the Southwest while he

was recuperating from a severe illness that had caused him to drop out of Princeton after his first year. He was 21 at the time. He became fluent in their language and society, lived with them for extended periods of time, and traveled to remote sites of their culture. He was known to them affectionately by his Navaho name, "Hasteen Clyde."

He published his first book in 1927, *To the Foot of the Rainbow*,⁷⁰ an account of his pack trip across the American Southwest. He completed his AB at the University of Wisconsin in 1928, studied in Vienna and was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, after which he taught at the University of Arizona. He completed his doctorate at Harvard in 1936. He kept in constant touch with the Navaho people during this period and made numerous trips back to the Southwest. He kept up these close contacts for the rest of his life. In particular, he began a longitudinal study of a single Navaho community, which produced heretofore unknown discoveries about their customs and culture. Over the years, he became a major contributor to the refinement of ethnographic methods. He studied their chants and song ceremonies, their childrearing practices, and combined psychoanalysis, analysis of social structure, and learning theory in his pioneering study *Navaho Witchcraft* (1944).⁷¹ He made major contributions to the field of anthropology and was elected president of the American Anthropological Association in 1947.

He was at once the consummate scientist and humanist, writing on topics from population genetics to psychoanalysis. *Mirror for Man*⁷² and *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*⁷³ allowed him to make generalizations across cultures about structures and values. These culminated in his Cooperative Study of Values in Five Cultures project. Talcott Parsons noted that Kluckhohn was one of the principle founders and mainstays of the Laboratory and Department of Social Relations and a prominent citizen of the university as a whole. Kluckhohn also had numerous friends, among them, he was an old friend of John Dollard from their days as students at Wisconsin, and he was close friends of Alexander and Dorothea Leighton. Abram Kardiner and Ralph Linton, and Robert Merton were also his friends and colleagues. He was also influenced to varying degrees by Boas, Sapir, and to a lesser extent Ruth Benedict. He died of a heart attack in 1960, while typing in an isolated cabin near Santa Fe.

There was also Pitirim Aleksandrovich Sorokin (1889–1968).⁷⁴ Sorokin was born in Russia into an alcoholic and violent family life where his mother died when he was young. He was raised by an uncle into mysticism and Russian Orthodox symbolism. His early life was one of a constantly starving young revolutionary against the Tzar, for which he was jailed several times. In jail, he did have access to food, a bed, and especially books, of which he took full advantages to continue his studies. He taught for the Soviets between 1919 and 1922, until they, too, jailed him. Nevertheless, he established the first Department of Sociology at the University of Petrograd in 1919.

As a sociologist, Sorokin was influenced by Durkheim, Spencer, and Comte, and in psychology by Pavlov. His books carried such titles as *The Sociology of Revolution* (1925/1967),⁷⁵ *The Crisis of our Age* (1941),⁷⁶ *Power and Morality* (1959),⁷⁷ and *Hunger as a Factor in Human Affairs* (1975).⁷⁸ His basic thesis as a criminal

anthropologist was that in societies where extreme poverty existed side by side with plenty, criminality would go up due to class struggle and the breakdown of the protection of possessions. Individuals followed either the laws of the spirit or the laws of sensate pleasure, which then defined the direction of culture. In this way, a culture either deteriorated or flourished. In a successful society, God, Sorokin believed, ruled through the State. C. Wright Mills was heavily influenced by his writings and Robert Merton was one of his students.

When Sorokin first came to Harvard in 1930, there was no Department of Sociology, so he began teaching in the Department of Economics. There he met a young instructor named Talcott Parsons. Sorokin was the only professor in Sociology when it finally was established and Parsons also came over from Economics, but with a lower rank. Nevertheless, Parsons was eventually able to make his influence known through his theory of action and became a powerbroker within his own domain. He was more in the tradition of American functionalism than Sorokin and made a stronger alliance with others such as Murray and Allport. Sorokin entered into bitter struggle with Parsons along the way. Parsons followed the Chicago School, which Sorokin thought too philosophical and indecisive, while Sorokin himself was more sensate. Between 1937 and 1941, Sorokin published a four-volume work with the help of numerous scholars and students, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*.⁷⁹ After he gave up the chairmanship of Sociology in 1942, the department was reorganized under Parsons, and Sorokin went on to found the Center for Creative Altruism, but was no longer a force on the Harvard scene as he had been before.

Parsons (1902–1979), born in Colorado Springs, majored in biology and anthropology at Amherst, attended the London School of Economics, and received his PhD from the University of Heidelberg in sociology and economics. After a stint teaching at Amherst, he began teaching at Harvard as an instructor in 1927 and, after joining Sorokin in the newly founded Department of Sociology, rose rapidly with the success of such major works as *The Structure of Social Action* (1937),⁸⁰ which was a review of Weber, Durkheim, and Pareto in an attempt to derive general principles governing social systems. At one point he became much enamored with psychoanalysis, undergoing training himself as a lay analyst and incorporating psychoanalytic ideas into his theories. This he followed with such works as *Essays in Sociological Theory: Pure and Applied* (1949)⁸¹ and *The Social System* (1951),⁸² in which he argued for homeostasis as well as a holistic approach to the study of social systems, and the multi-authored volume *Toward A General Theory of Action* (1951).⁸³

There is discussion among historians of the social sciences regarding the so-called Parsons School of Sociology, some contending that Parsons founded the Department of Social Relations himself to further his own ends (he was merely the Chairman, a low man's job at Harvard). In reality, there were bigger egos than his own that he had to deal with and the situation was more one of unruly optimism in which criticism, debate, and freewheeling discussion prevailed rather than a strong leader in charge of a hierarchy. An example was The 1949 Carnegie Seminar, sponsored by the Carnegie endowment, which became the basis for *Toward a General Theory of Action*. According to Lawrence Nichols, West Virginia University,

who has been mining the transcripts of this seminar, Parsons had advocates in Shils, E. C. Tolman, there on a visiting professorship, and Freed Bales, mainly an observer. Clyde Kluckhohn, Samuel Stouffer, and Richard Sheldon remained friendly critics, while the dissenters were Allport, Murray, and Robert Sears.⁸⁴

Yet another figure at the time was George C. Homans, founder of behavioral sociology and expert in the social group. Homans was born in Boston in 1910 and died in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1989. He was one of the original Harvard Society of Fellows, along with B. F. Skinner and Willard van Orman Quine, and best known for a work he published on Pareto and another on 13th-century English villagers.⁸⁵ He found his way onto the University faculty through L. J. Henderson, champion of Pareto's philosophy, and Elton Mayo over in the Business School, who was working on the famous Hawthorne experiments.⁸⁶ There, much more enamored with Pierre Janet than with Freud, Mayo introduced Homans to the literature of psychodynamics.

There can be little doubt where Homans stood in relation to psychology. At one point he contributed to a volume on *Explanation in the Behavioral Sciences* and there wrote on "The relevance of psychology to the explanation of social phenomena." Others, such as Charles Taylor, Stephen Tolman, Karl Pribram, Noam Chomsky, and Hans Eysenck also contributed. Homans focused on the necessary and sufficient conditions for a theory to be considered scientific and relied heavily on the epistemology of behaviorism to prove his point. Psychology, he thought, was one of the many disciplines which he subsumed under sociology, since interactions between people constitutes the majority of that discipline. Personality he defined as "that precariously integrated group of interrelated responses that makes a man an individual." No other theory in psychology was considered, except in one section where he compared conditioned learning in the growth of the child and Freud's conceptions of the Id, Ego, and Superego, did not find the theories incompatible, and concluded that Freud could be considered "the first great behavioral psychologist."⁸⁷

When Homans was discharged from the Armed Services and returned to Harvard in the spring term of 1945–1946, he was given one of two tenured positions newly created for the Department of Social Relations by Dean Paul Buck. The other went to Samuel Stouffer, a statistician. At the first faculty meeting of the School of Arts and Sciences that he attended the Department was voted into existence. Homans mentioned in his autobiography how different he was from the rest of the Social Relations Faculty; "If the founding fathers had fully understood how different, in some ways, though not in all, my ideas from theirs, I doubt if they would have shown themselves so ready to welcome this viper into their bosoms."⁸⁸ He got along well with most of the senior people. Murray, for instance, had been an old friend of the Homans family and they both shared an interest in Melville, but for very different reasons. But Homans was closest to the junior faculty and the graduate students. Among them, he named Jerry Bruner, Oscar Handlin, Florence Kluckhohn, Barrington Moore, Jr., Robert White, Richard Sheldon, David Aberle, David Schneider, Hank Riecken, Joe Kahl, Chuck Tilly, Kim Romney, Dan Rosenblatt, and others.

His differences with the department were all intellectual, he reported. He thought all the social sciences should be integrated under the same principles. The only problem was he thought these were the principles of behavior. The lineage of culture and personality theorists he called the “culture–vultures,” especially Kluckhohn. Of Freud, he remained “totally skeptical.” Durkheim he believed wrong in his idea that society was an entity, “something more than the resultant of individual human beings.” He was also in favor of the new effort in the Social Relations Department to move away from pure theory methodologically and to bring in more statistics, although he could not do any such calculations himself. Stouffer did get up before 700 undergraduates in the intro course, however, and announce that statistical polling was now so accurate that they knew ahead of time that Dewey would win over Truman in the national election the next day, but that gaffe was not serious enough for statistical methodology to be abandoned even in Social Relations. Homans also noted that experimental social psychologists tended to not engage themselves in much fieldwork. While it was true that the thrust of the Department of Social Relations remained more in the direction of the human sciences, using the ethnographic approach and the case study method, it continued to fight the encroachment of reductionistic empiricism into its domain. Homans reported in this regard the attempt to have an on-going seminar in methods in social relations. After a year it was discontinued, because everyone seemed to have different methods and no one was really interested in changing.

Similarly, the lines of communication in the faculty remained akimbo. The plan was that there would be two committees, a senior one and a junior one. The senior faculty met once a week and occasionally sent memoranda down to the junior faculty for comment and feedback. But they never seemed to take the feedback seriously. Thus, when *Toward a General Theory of Social Action* came out in 1951, it seemed mainly about the theories of Parsons and Shils, not much about the work of the other senior people. It was then handed down to the junior faculty for approval, who were enjoined to take it up as the official doctrine of the Department and a guide to all future research and teaching. Homans stood up and, quite to everyone’s surprise because he was normally so mild-mannered, declared that quite impossible; there were no absolute doctrines in science, and Stouffer stood up and agreed with him. To Homan’s surprise, Parsons, the chairman of the Department, retreated on the matter, although his theories continued to dominate students in sociology in the Department for some years.

The majority of students came originally as returning servicemen and saw in the new fusion a possible answer to what they had seen of human nature’s destructiveness during the War. Some sense that society could be changed for the better seemed afoot. Eventually, as these numbers declined, the main thrust of the students entering the concentration became personality psychology and self-development, while the zeal to change society as a whole waned. Eventually, the largest numbers of students were undergraduates who did not continue on in any one of the specific disciplines that initiated the Department in the first place. The Department never offered a single doctorate, for instance, but gave degrees in clinical psychology (really personality),

social psychology, social anthropology, and sociology, so its influence in the wider world remained diffuse.

Nevertheless, in 1946, when it was first founded, the announcements of the new experiment were all glorious, great advances in learning were forecast, and a new interdisciplinary era for psychology was supposedly ushered in. At its very outset, Social Relations even drew the largest classes in the University. The darker side of it, however, was that tensions had mounted unbearably between the experimentalists, who advocated reductionistic operationism and subsumed psychology under the allegedly more important rubric of empirical laboratory science, and the humanists who, most of them, embraced dynamic theories of the unconscious, performed experiments of a more qualitative nature in science, but held the person as central to the discipline, not the identity of the psychologist as a scientist.

Boring, himself, unable to hold the reins of strong and unruly egos, must have secretly harbored a certain sense of glee at the loss of unity he had attempted to demonstrate on the surface. Meanwhile, down below, the split allowed for the inward fulfillment of a deeper agenda that had brought Boring to Harvard in the first place—to achieve Titchener's goal to establish a general Wundtian laboratory science as the only basis for a legitimate experimental psychology. In 1946, the soft sciences were out and the hard sciences were in as far as the definition of psychology was concerned at the University.

A milestone back in 1934 had been when psychology, which had always been harbored in the Philosophy Department since William James's time, was established, but still within the Department of Philosophy as its own semi-independent committee. Boring introduced the measure in the general faculty meeting and it passed. Then, in 1938, with regard to a wider discussion of semi-independent committees that existed within several Departments, Boring rose in the faculty meeting and proposed the abolition of all committees and the elevation of each to its own Departmental status. Where most other universities had long ago separated psychology from philosophy, Harvard was the last to do so, and at that late date. Eight years later, in 1946, the separation of psychology as a laboratory science from psychologically oriented studies under the rubric of Social Relations brought a quarter of a century of engineering on Boring's part to a point of glorious fulfillment. He just could not tell anyone, as he was only half-aware of it himself. But it did represent the completion of a lifework and the fulfillment of a great spiritual task. Psychology, without its excess baggage, was now truly scientific.

As he headed into retirement, Boring produced a second edition to his *A History of Experimental Psychology* (1950).⁸⁹ There, contrary to the 1929 edition, where James had founded the first experimental laboratory at Harvard in 1875, the origin myth was born, that, no! Wundt had now founded the first laboratory of experimental psychology, at Leipzig, but 4 years later in 1879. Here at last was a true scientific, laboratory-oriented Father of the field, but, of course, Grandfather to Boring, as Titchener had fulfilled the role of Wundt's spiritual son in America, and Boring had engineered the legacy at Harvard as Titchener's faithful intellectual offspring. Boring had at last secured the record of his lineage for posterity, and the Freuds, the Jungs, the Murrays, and the Allports were not in it.

Endnotes

1. Boring, E. G. (1961). *Psychologist at large: An autobiography and selected essays*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 3–84.
2. Boring, E. G. (1938). The society of experimental psychologists: 1904–1938. *American Journal of Psychology*, 51(2), 410–423.
3. “Titchener mistrusted the Harvard situation. If he went, he needed to dominate it, and to help with that he wished to bring me along as his adjutant to implement his biddings” (Boring, 1961, p. 29).
4. Boring remarked in his autobiography that Harvard likes to be either first or last in everything, and in the case of separating psychology from philosophy, they were last. Most other American universities, especially with the establishment of their graduate schools, had established psychology as a laboratory science independent of philosophy decades earlier. Johns Hopkins, Clark, University of Chicago, and most others had done so by the end of the 19th century. Harvard did not officially separate psychology from the Philosophy Department until 1938. In 1936, it was Boring who stood up and proposed making psychology a separate committee within philosophy, which was approved, and in 1938, he proudly arose again and proposed to abolish all committees throughout the School of Arts and Sciences, elevating them to the official status of independent Departments in their own right, which was also approved.
5. Allport, G. W. (1967). Autobiography. In E. G. Boring, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *A history of psychology in autobiography* (Vol. 5, pp. 3–25). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
6. Allport, G. W. (1923). *An Experimental study of the traits of personality, with application to the problem of Social diagnosis*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
7. The otherwise excellent biography of Allport does not develop Allport’s connections to gestalt psychology, despite Allport’s own statements to the contrary as to its importance. See Nicholson, I. (2003). *Inventing personality: Gordon Allport and the science of selfhood*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Insight into the Murray–Allport relationship, and hence what was really going on in the department in the 1930s, was also under-represented.
8. Ash, M. G. (1995). *Gestalt psychology in German culture, 1890–1967*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 290.
9. Ash, 1995, pp. 290–291.
10. Boring, 1950, p. 430.
11. Allport, G. W. (1938). William Stern: 1871–1938. *American Journal of Psychology*, 51(4), 770–773.
12. This instrument measured a continuous tone changing dynamically into another tone, rather than the traditional method of comparing two tones for a just noticeable difference.
13. Stern, W., & Spoerl, H. D. (1938). *General psychology from the personalistic standpoint*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
14. Material adapted from Ash (1995).
15. Adapted from Allport, 1938, pp. 770–774.
16. Nicholson, I. (1997b). To “Correlate Psychology and Social Ethics”: Gordon Allport and the first course in American personality psychology. *Journal of Personality*, 65(3), 773–742. I disagree with Prof. Nicholson in his interpretation of Allport on personality and character, due to the lack of any discussion of Francis Peabody’s “Ethics of the Social Question,” upon which the Department of Social Ethics was originally founded and Allport’s sense of what he later defined as the psychology of religion also found there.
17. H. A. Murray (personal communication, March, 27, 1982).
18. H. A. Murray (personal communication, May, 24, 1984).
19. H. A. Murray (personal communication, July, 16, 1984).

20. H. A. Murray (personal communication, April 17, 1987).
21. Murray later reported that the real estate broker had told him that the grandfather clock had stopped the moment of Myers's death in 1901 and had not worked since, but when Murray first stormed into the study and banged the door on entering the clock started working again. (H. A. Murray, personal communication, April 28, 1985).
22. Douglas, C. (Ed). (1997). *Visions: Notes of the seminar given in 1930–1934 by C. G. Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
23. Melville, H. (1851). *Moby-Dick: Or, the whale*. New York: Harper.
24. H.A.Murray (personal communication, November 5, 1985).
25. H. A. Murray (personal communication, January, 6, 1987). Historically, of course, the two periods are linked. Both psychologists and physicians were working on the lives of individuals and the psychology they generated was person centered. Gordon Allport, following Wilhelm Windelband, wrote extensively on ideographic versus nomothetic approaches to generate knowledge in psychology. The ideographic studies the person in-depth, while the nomothetic studies a single variable in large population samples. He lamented that by the late 1930s, most of psychology had turned to the study of the white rat and to nomothetic methods, though he and other personality theorists were the big holdouts. See, Allport, G. W. (1968). *The person in psychology: Selected essays*. Boston: Beacon Press. Reviewing the history of personality theory, Winter and Barenbaum imply that psychologists in general cannot handle the single case study, since they were originally trained exclusively in nomothetic methods. See Winter, D. G., & Barenbaum, N. B. (1999). History of modern personality theory and research. In L. A. Pervin and O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 3–27). New York: Guilford. Humanistic psychologists have continued the clinical tradition of the single case study in their pursuit of a person-centered science. See again, Kreuter (2006). *Victim vulnerability: An existential-humanistic interpretation of a single case study*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
26. White, B., Wolf, R., & Taylor, E. I. (1984). *Stanley Cobb: A builder of the modern neurosciences*. Boston: Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine.
27. Anderson, J. W. (1988). Henry A. Murray's early career: A psychobiographical exploration. *Journal of Personality*, 56(1), 139–171.
28. Boring, E. G. (1940). Was this analysis a success? *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55(1), 2–3, 3–10.
29. Boring (1929).
30. Boring, E. G. (1933). *The physical dimensions of consciousness*. New York, London: The Century Company.
31. This was very much like L. J. Henderson, the physical chemist who sponsored Skinner at the Harvard Society of Fellows, as well as originally hiring Murray. Henderson, a skeptic toward psychoanalysis from the beginning, once reported that he had talked into a dictaphone machine for 3 hours, had it transcribed, and on reading it found not one allusion to sexual matters. (The late John Adams Abbott, first assistant resident in the Department of Psychiatry at the MGH in 1934; J. A. Abbott, personal Communication, June, 5, 1984).
32. The distinction between depth psychology and social psychology became quite pronounced later, when radical political psychologists into race, class, and gender in the 1960s, who had no depth psychology beyond an ambivalent relationship to Freud, insisted that personality was defined by impersonal social forces acting on the individual but controlled by a ruling elite that had to be overthrown if the oppressed classed were to be emancipated. On the origin of SPSSI, see Nicholson (1997a).
33. Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
34. Freud, S. (1932–1933). New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 22, pp. 1–182). London: Hogarth Press.
35. Hendrick, I. (1934). *Facts and theories in psychoanalysis*. New York: A. A. Knopf.

36. Allport is probably best known for his concept of functional autonomy—to give a learning theorists' definition: the persistence of habits long after the original precipitating reinforcer has ceased to be a cause. His conception was more all embracing because it engaged psychologists in looking at the organism in the here and now as a dynamic entity whose interrelated systems were always changing, despite certain enduring characteristics.
37. Woodworth, R. S. (1918). *Dynamic psychology*. New York: Columbia University Press. p. 201
38. Allport, 1937, p. 358.
39. Allport, 1937, p. 386.
40. He was referring to Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill. The quote comes from Allport, 1937, p. 363.
41. Allport, 1937 p. 365.
42. Murray & the Workers at the Harvard Psychological Clinic (1938).
43. Murray et al., 1938, p. xi.
44. Murray et al., 1938, p. xii.
45. Murray et al., 1938, p. 3.
46. Murray et al., 1938, p. 25.
47. Murray et al., 1938, pp. 33–34.
48. Hale (1995).
49. A protégé of John B. Watson, Lashley's interest was in teaching the neural mechanisms of the conditioned response. Experiments that destroyed parts of the frontal lobe to discover their effect on learning in the white rat became the subject of his major work, *Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence: A Quantitative Study of Injuries to the Brain*, which came out in 1929. His work focused on conditioned learning theory in psychology and localization of function in neurology. This led him to the search for the engram, which he believed to be a neurological trace created in the brain though learning, though he never found it. See Lashley, K. S. (1929). *Brain mechanisms and intelligence: A quantitative study of injuries to the brain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Lashley, K. S. (1935). The mechanism of vision, Part 12: Nervous structures concerned in the acquisition and retention of habits based on reactions to light. *Comparative Psychology Monographs* 11, 43–79; Lashley, K. S. (1950). In search of the engram. *Society of Experimental Biology, Symposium* 4, 454–482.
50. Stagner, R. (1937). *Psychology of personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
51. Murphy, L. (1990). *Gardner Murphy: Integrating, expanding, and humanizing psychology*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland. See also Murphy, L. (Ed.). (1989). *There is more beyond: Selected papers of Gardner Murphy*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company.
52. Barrett, W. (1911). *Psychical research*. New York: Henry Holt.
53. Murphy, L. 1990, pp. 90–91.
54. Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Powers, E. (1933). *Studies in expressive movement*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
55. Murphy, L., 1990, pp. 175–176.
56. Murphy, G., Jensen, F., & Levy, J. (1935). *Approaches to personality: Some contemporary conceptions used in psychology and psychiatry* (2nd printing). New York: Coward-McCann, Inc.
57. Murphy, G., & Murphy, L. (1931). *Experimental social psychology*. New York: Harper.
58. Murphy, L. 1990, p. 164.
59. Lawrence K. Frank (1890–1968) was born in Cincinnati, OH, and died in Boston. He received his bachelor's degree in economics from Columbia University in 1912. He first worked as a systems analyst for the New York Telephone Company, but in 1923 began to work at the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial. He later worked for the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation and the Caroline Zachary Institute of Human Development. He retired in 1955 to Boston. Influential in the Child Development movement he also helped define what came to be called the “behavioral sciences.” As associate director of the Spellman Fund, one of the leading financiers of child development research during the 1930s and 1940s, he championed the new

- holistic interdisciplinary paradigm of human development that recognized individual differences among particular children, and which incorporated knowledge not only from evolutionary natural science, but from the social sciences as well. Applying this holistic paradigm to developmental theory, Frank argued that the central problem of child development research was to understand the development of the whole child. He advocated that researchers be child centered by understanding that children are emerging, becoming, and dynamically learning. Portions excerpted from "What is 'Normal' Adolescent Growth?" A Paper Presented at the History of Childhood in America Conference, August 5, 6, 2000, Washington, DC by Heather Munro Prescott, Central Connecticut State University (Information, courtesy of Pamela Matz, Widener Library, reference desk).
60. Thurstone began his studies as an electrical engineer, developing several motion picture innovations that attracted the attention of, and led to an offer of employment with Thomas Edison in 1912. However, Thurstone was more interested in studying the "learning function," and continued his academic studies at the University of Chicago. He later stated that G. H. Mead's lectures on social psychology were the greatest influence on his development in psychology. In his early work in psychology, Thurstone rejected the popular stimulus-oriented psychology in favor of a person-centered approach.
 61. Lewin, K. (1931). The conflict between Aristotelian and Galilean modes of thought in contemporary psychology. *Journal of genetic psychology*, 5, 141–177.
 62. Morrow, A. J. (1969). *The practical theorist: The life and work of Kurt Lewin*. New York and London: Basic Books, pp. 112–113.
 63. Morrow, 1969, p. 138.
 64. Murray, H. A. (1948). *Assessment of men: Selection of personnel for the Office of Strategic Services*. New York: Rinehart.
 65. Gregg, A. (1947). *The place of psychology in an ideal university: The report of the university commission to advise on the future of psychology at Harvard*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 66. Gregg, 1947, p. 2.
 67. Gregg, 1947, p. 6.
 68. Gregg, 1947, p. 42.
 69. Eventually, clinical psychology at Harvard landed in the postgraduate APA approved clinical programs associated with the different departments of psychiatry at the various teaching hospitals at the Harvard Medical School.
 70. Kluckhohn, C. (1927). *To the foot of the rainbow: A tale of twenty-five hundred miles of wandering on horseback through southwest enchanted land*. New York, London: Century Company.
 71. Kluckhohn, C. (1944). *Navaho witchcraft*. Cambridge, MA: The Peabody Museum.
 72. Kluckhohn, C. (1949). *Mirror for man: Relation of anthropology to modern life*. New York: Whittlesey/McGraw-Hill Book Company.
 73. Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. Cambridge, MA: The Museum.
 74. Sorokin, P. A. (1963). *A long journey: The autobiography of Pitirim A. Sorokin*. New Haven, CT: College and University Press.
 75. Sorokin, P. A. (1925). *The sociology of revolution*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.
 76. Sorokin, P. A. (1941). *The crisis of our age: The social and cultural outlook*. New York: E. P. Dutton; Sorokin, P. A. (1992) (2nd revised ed.). London: Oneworld.
 77. Sorokin, P. A., & Lunden, W. A. (1959). *Power and morality: Who shall guard the guardians?* Boston: P. Sargent.
 78. Sorokin, P. A. (1975). *Hunger as a factor in human affairs* (E. P. Sorokin, Trans.). Gainesville, FL: University Presses of Florida.; See also Sorokin, P. A. (1950). *Altruistic love: A study of American "good neighbors" and Christian saints*. Boston: Beacon Press; Sorokin, P. A. (1947). *Society, culture, and personality: Their structure and dynamics, a system of general sociology*. New York: Harper.

79. Sorokin, P. A. (1937–1941). *Social and cultural dynamics*. New York: American Book Company.
80. Parsons, T. (1937). *The structure of social action*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
81. Parsons, T. (1949). *Essays in sociological theory, pure and applied*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. See also Parsons, T. (1942). Age and sex in the social structure. *American Sociological Review*, 7(5), 604–616.
82. Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
83. Parsons, T., & Shils, E. (1951). *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
84. Nichols, L. (2006, June). *The genesis of the Parsons school in sociology: Dialogue versus charisma in the 1949 Carnegie Seminar*. Paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of Chevron, International Society for History in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, NY.
85. Homans, G. C., & Curtis, C. P. (1934). *An introduction to Pareto: His sociology*. New York: A. A. Knopf; and Homans, G. C. (1941). *English villagers of the thirteenth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
86. Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University; and Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
87. Homans, G. (1970). The relevance of psychology to the explanation of social phenomena. In R. T. Borger & F. Cioffi (Eds.), *Explanation in the behavioral sciences* (pp. 313–329). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. Eysenck, in the same volume, wrote on “Explanation and the Concept of Personality.” While he identified the *Geisteswissenschaften*, or ideographic psychologists like Allport, from the *Naturwissenschaften*, or nomothetic psychologists such as himself, he was careful to point out that the Allport types operated outside the bounds of the exact sciences. The rest of the chapter was an analysis of the hypothetico-deductive model of research, demonstrating how measurable personality variables are at the heart of other measured variables in an experiment and need to be accounted for. See Eysenck, H. J. (1970). Explanation and the concept of personality. In R. T. Borger & F. Cioffi (Eds.), *Explanation in the behavioral sciences* (pp. 387–424). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
88. Homans, G. S. (1984). *Coming to my senses: The autobiography of a sociologist*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, p. 296.
89. Boring (1950).